Pacific School of
Religion
Berkeley, Calif.

THE ART BIN

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/expositor-1875_1917_13

THE EXPOSITOR

VOL. XIII.

List of Contributors to Volume XIII

Rev. Edwin A. Abbott, D.D.
Rev. Professor B. W. Bacon, D.D.
Rev. Professor Vernon Bartlet, D.D.
Rev. Principal W. H. Bennett, Litt.D.
Rev. W. S. Bishop, D.D.
Rev. E. F. Brown, M.A.
Rev. Professor C. J. Cadoux, M.A., B.D.
Rev. J. Robertson Cameron, M.A.
Rev. Professor G. A. Cooke, D.D.
Rev. Canon Anthony C. Deane, M.A.
Rev. W. D. Gardiner, M.A., B.D.
Professor Frank Granger, Litt.D.
Rev. Professor H. M. Haydn, M.A., B.D.
Rev. Professor A. G. Hogg, M.A.
Rev. John A. Hutton, D.D.
Rev. Maurice Jones, D.D.
Rev. Professor H. A. A. Kennedy, D.D.
Rev. John Macaskill, M.A.
Lieut.-Col. G. Mackinlay, Late R.A.
Rev. Professor H. R. Mackintosh, D.D.
Rev. R. A. C. Macmillan, M.A., D.Phil.
Rev. Professor D. S. Margoliouth, Litt.D., F.B.A.
Enrico Masini, LL.D.
Rev. Professor James Moffatt, D.D., Litt.D.
Rev. Professor D. Plooij, D.D.
Rev. M. A. Power, S.J.
Rev. J. G. Radford, B.D.
Rev. J. E. Roberts, M.A., B.D.
Rev. Professor A. T. Robertson, D.D.
Rev. Edgar Rogers, M.A.
Rev. C. F. Russell, M.A.
Rev. M. H. Segal, M.A.
Rev. Canon A. Sloman, M.A.
Rev. Professor W. H. Griffith Thomas, D.D.
Rev. William Watson, B.D.
Rev. Walter R. Whately, M.A.
Rev. Robert Wood, M.A. [Wellington, N.Z.]
The Author of "The Sacrament."

THE EXPOSITOR

EDITED BY THE REV.

SIR W. ROBERTSON NICOLL, M.A., LL.D.

EIGHTH SERIES

Volume XIII

Pacific School of Religion
Berkeley, Calif.

HODDER AND STOUGHTON
WARWICK SQUARE, LONDON, E.C.

MCMXVII

Ser. 8
v. 12
1917:1

BUTLER & TANNER,
THE SELWOOD PRINTING WORKS
FROME, AND LONDON.

THE PETRINE SUPPLEMENTS OF MATTHEW.

The leanings of our first canonical Gospel toward a Jewish-Christian type of teaching have been clearly recognised both in ancient and modern times. Some question exists among modern critics as to its place of origin, the majority considering it a product of Palestinian Christianity (whether in Jerusalem or Caesarea), a few suggesting Egypt, whose relations with Jerusalem were always exceedingly close; but all recognise its strongly marked Jewish-Christian point of view. We need only enumerate a few of the sayings peculiar to this Gospel to bear out the generally admitted fact.

1. Give not that which is holy to dogs, lest they turn and rend you; nor cast your pearls before swine, lest they trample them with their feet (Matt. vii. 6).

2. Go not away to the Gentiles, and enter no city of the Samaritans, but go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel (x. 6).

3. When they persecute you in this city flee to the other; for verily I say to you, Ye shall not exhaust the cities of Israel till the Son of Man come (x. 23).[1]

With this "limitation of the mission of the Messiah and His Apostles to the Jewish nation" admitting extension of the blessings of the kingdom to Gentiles, but only in the Isaian sense (Isa. lx. 3, 6; cf. Matt. ii. 10; viii. 11), there is combined, as the most careful of recent commentators has observed,[2] an "insistence on the permanent validity of the Mosaic law" exhibited in a whole series of supple-

[1] For further examples in the same vein see Allen, *Intern. Crit. Comm. on Matt.*, p. lxxvi. f.

[2] *Ibid.*

ments and alterations to the Markan source. The most familiar instance is the passage introductory to the Sermon on the Mount: "Think not that I came to destroy the law or the prophets," etc. Allen enumerates a long series in like vein, but gives no heed to another kindred series of passages peculiar to Matthew wherein special warning is given against the teachers and workers of "lawlessness" (ἀνομία). These passages are certainly not less significant than the former of the evangelist's interest to maintain the permanent validity of the Mosaic law. Some of the more important may be recalled in abstract as follows:—

1. Enter ye in by the narrow gate (after "this is the law and the prophets"). . . . Beware of false prophets who come to you in sheep's clothing. . . . Many will say to me in that day, Lord, Lord, did we not prophesy by thy name, and exorcise by thy name, and do many miracles by thy name? . . . Depart from me, ye that work lawlessness (ἀνομία) (Matt. vii. 13–23, cf. Luke vi. 43–46, and Mark ix. 38–40).

2. (Additions to the Markan parable of the Patient Husbandman (Mark iv. 26-29, in Matt. xiii. 24, 30, 36–43). While men slept his enemy came and sowed tares. . . . Gather up first the tares and bind them in bundles to burn them. . . . The tares are the sons of the Evil One, and the enemy that sowed them is the devil. . . . And they shall gather out of his kingdom all things that cause stumbling and them that do lawlessness (ἀνομία) and cast them into the furnace of fire. . . .

3. (Addition to the parable of the Great Supper, Matt. [xxii. 11–14; cf. Luke). But when the king came in to inspect the guests he saw there a man who had not on a wedding garment (the rabbinic 'garment of good works'). . . . Bind him and cast him out into the outer darkness.

4. And many false prophets shall arise and shall lead many astray, and because lawlessness (ἀνομία) shall be multiplied the love of the many shall wax cold (Matt. xxiv. 11 f.).

Together with these five characteristics indicative of a Jewish Christian provenance for the Gospel: (1) insistence on the permanent validity of the Mosaic law, (2) limitation of the mission to the Jewish nation and its adherents,

(3) title and conception of the 'kingdom of the heavens,' (4) Jewish phraseology, and (5) exacerbated anti-Pharisaic polemic, Dr. Allen very properly includes (6) "the interest shown in St. Peter and the prominent position attributed to him." We shall confine our enquiry to this last-named factor, endeavouring to interpret in their significance as related to primitive church history the three remarkable additions peculiar to this Gospel by which the Markan portrait of Peter has been embellished.

Before dismissing, however, the other "Jewish-Christian" peculiarities of the Gospel which Allen has classified under the five heads just enumerated it is well to emphasise and corroborate his statement that the sixth peculiarity—exaltation of the authority of Peter—does "point in the same direction." It *is* a "Jewish-Christian" trait. It has nothing to do with the much later phenomenon of the exaltation of the see of Rome. In short, even so eminent a scholar as Julius Grill, in attempting to account for the phenomenon as due to Roman influence in the time of Victor (!) must be regarded as under some temporary hallucination. Rome does not so much as come within the horizon of the first Gospel; and if it did it would be treated merely as one of the "cities of the Gentiles" forbidden to the followers of the Son of David, even as a refuge, until his coming as the Son of Man. The Church may anticipate being driven from "the holy city" (Matt. iv. 5), "the city of the Great King" (Matt. v. 35), by persecution; Jerusalem is guilty of the blood of the prophets, it will experience the wrath of the king who "sent forth his armies and destroyed those murderers and burned up their city" (Matt. xx. 7), but some one of "the cities of Israel" must ever remain the seat of the representatives of the Son of Man until a repentant Jerusalem cries to him: "Hosanna, blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord" (Matt. xxiii. 34, 39).

Such is the unswerving loyalty of the first evangelist to the land and the people of the Covenant. His anti-Pharisaism is but the converse aspect of his intense devotion to what he considers "a nation bringing forth the fruits" of the kingdom (xxi. 43). The famous passage on Peter as the rock-foundation of the church, if it were, as Grill declares, a coinage of "Rome's own," could only be an interpolation of so late a date (*ca.* 190) as would inevitably have left its mark in the transmission of the text. Moreover (Schmiedel himself to the contrary notwithstanding) [1] it is *not* "open to us to regard Matthew xvi. 17–19 as an interpolation unless the whole redactional treatment of Mark by this evangelist is to be put in the same category. To attempt to connect it with the pretensions of the see of Rome in the period of Victor is to commit the anachronism of confounding the Petro-Pauline controversies of the first century with those of a full century later. In the time of Victor, Peter as a "pillar" of the apostolic community in Jerusalem, as protagonist of the Jewish element which opposed Paul at Antioch, as pattern of the Cephas party at Corinth had been forgotten, Peter of the apocryphal Acts, of the Petrine Epistles and Apocalypse, and of the Clementine Romances, Peter the founder, bishop and martyr of the church of Rome had come to take his place.[2]

The Petrine supplements to the Gospel of Matthew cannot be treated singly, nor are they limited to "the two incidents relating to St. Peter" (xiv. 29–31 and xvii. 24–27) which Allen finds to be "nearly related in character." We must

[1] *Encycl. Bibl.* II. col. 1892.

[2] For the views of Grill see his *Der Primat des Petrus*, 1904, pp. 77–79. Cf. Schmiedel *s.v.* "Gospels" in *Enc. Bibl.* II. col. 1892; and P. Schmidt, *Die Geschichte Jesu*, II. pp. 32, 51. Schmiedel refers to "many" as "disposed to bring down the date of the entire Gospel as late as 130" on account of 16, 17–19 and kindred passages. He himself thinks it "open to regard xvi. 17–19, xxviii. 9 f., 19 or chaps. i. f. as interpolations.' P. Schmidt considers the passage derived "from unknown sources."

at least include with these the famous passage (xvi. 17–19) on Peter as the Rock-foundation of the Church. They cannot be derived one from a "Peraean Document P"; the other from a "Galilean Document G," as an eminent American scholar would have us believe.[1] They are all three from the same workshop, drawn up in the same "Jewish-Christian" interest, in the same characteristic style of Jewish *midrash*; none show the slightest relation to the second century legends of Peter at Rome, or the authority of the Roman cathedra. Like the additions in support of "the law and the prophets," against antinomian teachers who call Jesus "Lord" but do not the things He commanded, who claim to do "many mighty works in His name" but are sowers of tares, wolves in sheep's clothing "whose end is to be burned," the Petrine supplements to Matthew are purely Jewish-Christian, both in form and substance, completely harmonious in purpose with the special aim of this evangelist, for Matthew conceives his task as a "teaching all men everywhere to observe all things whatsoever I (Jesus) have commanded."

In seeking to determine the nature of this Matthaean Jewish-Christian interest we may limit our attention to these three Petrine supplements attached respectively to the Markan story of Jesus' Walking on the Sea (Mark vi. 45–52), in Matthew xiv. 28–32, to the Markan account of the Rebuke of Peter at Caesarea Philippi (Mark viii. 27–30) in Matthew xvi. 17–19, and to the Markan group of sayings on Receiving and Stumbling (Mark ix. 33–50) in Matthew

[1] "Principles of Literary Criticism and the Synoptic Problem," by Ernest De Witt Burton, in *Decennial Publications of the University of Chicago*, 1904, p. 49 (241). In a footnote Prof. Burton shows misgivings at the separation and admits that "On purely internal grounds one would perhaps refer xvi. 17–19, xvii. 24–27, xix. 28, xxii. 7, xxvi. 52, 53, to the minor source 7 (other narratives peculiar to Matthew); but hastens to add that "for such reference there is no objective ground."

xvii. 24–27. They have, of course, a certain similarity to the ordinary type of small editorial corrections by which all the later evangelists seek to palliate the frequent severe animadversions of Mark upon the conduct of the Apostles and on Peter in particular. An excellent survey of these rehabilitations of the Apostles in Mathew, is provided by Allen in the Introduction to his *Commentary* (p. xxxiii. f.). We may venture to transcribe it as illustrative of the general tendency of the times, omitting only the reference to Matthew xvi. 17–19.

In Mark iv. 13 there is a rebuke addressed to the disciples, "Do ye not know this parable, and how shall ye appreciate all the parables?" In Matthew xiii. 16–17 this rebuke is omitted, and there is inserted instead a blessing, "Blessed are your eyes," etc.

In Mark iv. 40 *οὔπω ἔχετε πίστιν* becomes *ὀλιγόπιστοι* in Matthew viii. 26; Mark vi. 52 *οὐ γὰρ συνῆκαν ἐπὶ τοῖς ἄρτοις ἀλλ' ἦν αὐτῶν ἡ καρδία πεπωρωμένη*, is omitted from Matthew xiv. 33.

Mark viii. 17 *πεπωρωμένην ἔχετε τὴν καρδίαν ὑμῶν; ὀφθαλμοὺς ἔχοντες οὐ βλέπετε καὶ ὦτα ἔχοντες οὐκ ἀκούετε*, is omitted at Matthew xvi. 9, and in ver. 12 a statement is inserted to the effect that the disciples did understand.

At Mark ix. 13 another clause is inserted to emphasise the fact that the disciples understood Christ's teaching (Matt. xvii. 13).

From Mark ix. 5, Matthew xvii. 4 omits the statement that St. Peter "knew not what to answer."

Mark ix. 10, which records that the disciples disputed about the rising from the dead, is omitted at Matthew xvii. 9.

For Mark ix. 32, "And they understood not the saying, and were afraid to ask Him" there is substituted in Matthew xvii. 23 the harmless words "And they were very grieved."

From Mark ix. 33–34 Matthew omits the statements that the disciples had disputed who was the greater among them (xviii. 1).

In Mark x. 35 an ambitious request is ascribed to James and John. In Matthew xx. 20 this request is transferred to the mother of the two Apostles.

In Mark iv. 10–13 the Twelve are represented as ignorant of the meaning of Christ's parables. Matthew avoids this.

From Mark xiv. 40 the words, "and they knew not what to answer Him," are omitted by Matthew xxvi. 43.

Compare also the omission of *οἱ δὲ μαθηταὶ ἐθαμβοῦντο ἐπὶ τοῖς λόγοις*

αὐτοῦ (Mark x. 24) in Matthew xix. 23, and the omission of καὶ ἐθαμβοῦντο (Mark x. 32) in Matthew xx. 17.

Such a list gives ample proof of the tendency common to all the later and dependent Gospels to rehabilitate the Apostles from their remarkably unfavorable representation in Mark. But greatly as the Matthaean changes of this type exceed those of like kind in Luke, and even those of the fourth Gospel, they are quite surpassed both in nature and extent by the three Petrine supplements of Matthew xiv. 28 ff., xvi. 17–19 and xvii. 24–27. In these we have no mere general rehabilitation of the Apostles, but a special apologetic for the authority of Peter, and not mere redaction but creative composition. It is of course possible with some critics to postulate an independent source (or sources !) whence the evangelist might derive the anecdotes ; but in view of the dependent character of two out of the three as attachments to existing Markan narrative, and the affinity of purpose already noted with the general redaction it seems far more reasonable to attribute them to the kind of imaginative homiletic elaboration illustrated in the *midrashim* and the interjected interpretative anecdotes of the *targums*, whether it be the evangelist's own homiletic imagination or that of some contemporary Jewish-Christian preacher which was responsible for their origin. At all events, as compared with the mere redactional touches which counteract the Markan representations unfavourable to the Apostles, they form a group by themselves, both as creative additions, and as having for their common presupposition, if not their common purpose, the exaltation of Peter. They correspond with the first evangelist's list of the Twelve (Matt. x. 2–4), wherein not only the order of Mark iii. 16–19 is changed, substituting " Peter " for " Andrew " at the beginning, but the designation " first " is explicitly prefixed to Peter's name. We may take them

up in the order of their occurrence in the first evangelist's adaptation of the Markan story.

1. Matthew xiv. 28–31 supplements the Markan story of Christ's walking on the sea (Mark vi. 46–52), taking the place of the second evangelist's moralising reflection.

> And they were sore amazed in themselves ; for they understood not concerning the loaves, but their heart was hardened.

Just what the disciples should have " understood concerning the loaves " had they not shared in the " hardening of heart " which affected Israel as a whole (Mark vii. 14, 18 ; viii. 17) is more or less in debate among commentators. According to the lamented Johannes Weiss it is not the mere power exhibited in the miraculous multiplication of food, but the *symbolism* of a transaction, intended to prefigure the eucharistic memorial of death and resurrection, as in John vi. 52–59 the symbolism of the Eucharist is actually connected with the miracles of the loaves and the walking on the sea. This symbolic interpretation has in its favour at least the succession of passages in Mark viii. 31–33 ; ix. 5 f., 10–13, 28 f., 31 f. ; x. 32–34 ; xi. 21–23 ; xiv. 27–31, by which the incapacity of the disciples and of Peter in particular to take in the doctrine of the cross and resurrection is brought into stronger and stronger prominence. It is not the Messiahship itself which is " hid from them." Mark contains no such " secret of the Messiahship " as Wrede contended, if Peter and the twelve are supposed to be ignorant of this. But the doctrine of a *dying* Messiah, returning to them from the conquest of the powers of the underworld —this is a secret which our second evangelist spares no pains to emphasise as presented first symbolically and at last " plainly " (παρρησίᾳ) by Jesus, but which remained " hid " from the " hardened " hearts of His disciples, a stumblingblock which at last led Peter to the point where he incurred the scathing rebuke of Mark viii 33.

The Blessing attached by Matthew to this Rebuke of Peter belongs therefore in a sense to the same class as the Blessing of all the Apostles attached in Matthew xiii. 16 f. in place of the Rebuke of Mark iv. 13.

But we have first to justify J. Weiss' contention for a symbolic sense in the Markan story of the Blessing of the Loaves and its sequel, the Walking on the Sea, which is supplemented by Matthew xiv. 28–31. The simplest means will be to transcribe the comment on Mark vi. 45–52 from a recent volume.

> The return by boat made without incident in viii. 10 is developed in this source (Q ?) into an allegorical parallel to iv. 35–41. R connects its symbolism with " the loaves " in ver. 52. Luke cancels, perhaps with regard for the handle a narrative of the kind would furnish to the docetists. Matthew takes the opposite course of elaborating the symbolism still further, thereby throwing welcome lights upon the origin of the tradition. The added traits that Peter asks to be bidden to walk with Jesus on the sea, attempts it, fails from lack of faith, is rescued by Jesus, the two coming then together to the disciples in the boat (Matt. xiv. 28–31), show that Matthew took the story to symbolise that of Gethsemane, when Peter offered to share Jesus' martyrdom and quailed before the storm ; but (as we learn from 1 Cor. xv. 5 ; Luke xx. 32) was restored by Jesus and became the " stablisher " of his brethren. Matthew's interpretation of the symbolism is doubtless correct. R (i.e. the second evangelist) here dilates upon the features which correspond to the helpless plight of the disciples after Jesus' arrest, and their deliverance by His reappearance, after having shown their incredulity of the resurrection.[1]

In this interpretation of the Walking on the Sea, it is regarded as a *midrashic* addition to the story of the Loaves. Jesus' lonely night of watching and prayer on the mountain-top while the disciples below are distressed by contrary winds is a parallel to the vigil of Gethsemane perpetuated in the annual church observance of the Passover feast of the Lord's death and resurrection. The " fourth watch of the

[1] Bacon, *Beginnings of Gospel Story*, 1909, p. 83.

night" when the Lord came to their deliverance is the traditional resurrection hour, so that the story as a whole (omitted by Luke) reflects the teaching of the Eucharistic incident of the Loaves much as the Transfiguration story reproduces in symbolic form the essential teaching of the preceding incident—the Confession and Rebuke of Peter. Confirmation of the *midrashic* view is found in the remarkable frequency in Jewish poetry of the figure of triumph over the stormy waves of the sea in application to Jehovah's victory over the powers of the underworld (e.g. Ps. lxxvii. 16, 19; Isa. xxvi. 19–xxvii.1). In early Christian symbolism it plays at least an equal part, witness the *Odes of Solomon* and the elaborate development of the allegory of ship and storm in the epistle of Clement to James of the *Clementine Homilies;* witness also the figure of Jonah and the symbol of the fish in primitive Christian art.

If this be in reality the original homiletic application of the Markan story of the Walking on the Sea, then the Matthaean supplement only carries out the allegory into more specific detail. Over and above the experience of the twelve it emphasises the special experience of Peter, outstripping all the rest in his protestation: "Lord, I am ready to go with thee, unto prison and death," conspicuous also in the collapse of his too self-confident faith, but distinguished most of all by the gracious intervention of the Lord, which not only made him "first" to behold the risen Christ, but the Lord's agent in restoring the rest. The story of how Peter, after the collapse, turned again and stablished his brethren, is missing from our mutilated Mark; but time was, if we may trust the references of Paul (1 Cor. xv. 5; Gal. ii. 8), and Luke (Luke xxii. 32; xxiv. 34), when this was the very heart of the resurrection story. May we not reasonably hold that Matthew's addition to that story of Mark which bears so many signs of allegorical reflection

of the great tragedy, is itself also allegorical? May it not, in short, reflect the historic fall and rising again of Peter? Is not this the meaning of its closing words, wherein Jesus is declared to be the "Son of God" with power by the resurrection, save that the manifestation comes to the Church through the agency not of Paul but of Peter?

And Peter answered Him and said, Lord, if it be thou, bid me come unto thee upon the waters. And He said, Come. And Peter went down from the boat, and walked upon the waters to come to Jesus. But when he saw the wind he was afraid; and beginning to sink, he cried out, saying, Lord save me. And immediately Jesus stretched forth his hand, and took hold of him, and saith unto him: O thou of little faith, wherefore didst thou doubt? And when they were gone up into the boat, the wind ceased. And they that were in the boat worshipped Him, saying of a truth thou art the Son of God.

2. If the first Petrine supplement of Matthew sets forth the Church's first great debt to Peter, the second is closely related to it. When in Matthew xvi. 16–19 the Markan story of the Rebuke of Peter is expanded by the prefixing of a Blessing of Peter as the Rock through whom the Church receives its faith in Jesus as "the Son of the living God" the reference is clearly the same as in the story of the Walking on the Sea; for here "they that were in the boat" are brought to the same confession by the return of Peter in company with Jesus. But the story goes further, giving the sanction of divine authority to Peter's apostleship and making specific application of this divine authority to the question of "binding and loosing," i.e., declaring obligatory or non-obligatory the requirements of the law. The promise that "the gates of Hades shall not prevail" against the Church which rests on Peter as its foundation "Rock" shows that it is still the *resurrection* faith which gives to Peter his leadership. Here again, as in the case of the Blessing (xiii. 16 f. *cf.* xvi. 17), Authority to Bind and Loose conferred on Peter is equivalent to conferring it on

all the Twelve (xvi. 19; *cf.* xviii. 18). But the phraseology employed makes it impossible to ignore the relationship Kreyenbühl has pointed out between this passage and Paul's defence of his own apostleship by divine right and gospel of freedom from the law in Galatians i. 11–17.

There can, of course, be no question as to literary priority. Paul claimed a divine authority for his apostleship to the Gentiles and for a gospel which loosed from the yoke of the law on the ground that God had "manifested his Son" in him. This revelation of the risen Christ made him an ambassador not from "flesh and blood." Moreover in Galatians ii. 8 this "working of God in" him is expressly brought into comparison with a similar divine working "in Peter unto an apostleship of the circumcision." This Pauline claim of an apostleship not from flesh and blood but from God's manifestation of his Son is the original. The Blessing of Peter in similar phraseology of Matthew xvi. 16–19 restricting to Peter the authority to bind and loose is the later copy. But we need not assume that the claim of divine authority for this Revelation of Peter, in spite of its immediate application to the question of "binding and loosing," is a direct polemic against Paul. No more than the Epistle of James with its warning against those who teach a doctrine of justification "by faith apart from works." No more than Acts with its consistent representation that Jews among the Gentiles, Paul himself included, are under obligation to "walk orderly, keeping the law," and to teach others similarly placed to "circumcise their children and to observe the customs." The author of James is not aware that he is contradicting Paul. The author of Acts is not aware that he is misrepresenting him. Both merely reflect the "Petrine" Christianity of their time, taking for granted that Paul was of the same way of thinking. To think of Paul as "loosing" even "one

of these least commandments " is to Luke, and probably to Matthew also, pure calumny. They launch their bolts against current antinomianism in full confidence that Paul would have agreed with them—as to a considerable extent he doubtless would.

It is quite true then, as Wellhausen has said, that Matthew xvi. 16–19 aims to confer upon Peter the directive law-making authority of the Jewish scribes.

> Peter is therefore regarded as a Scribe, just as all the disciples are in xiii. 52 ; what he declares on earth to be right or wrong will be ratified in heaven ; in other words his didactic authority is divine. Just as in xiii. 52 the Scribe is compared to a householder, so here the two functions are combined. But the first clause of the verse (" I will give unto thee the keys," etc.) must not be too closely connected with what follows. We may not identify " the *kingdom* of heaven " with " heaven," nor interpret the keys by the binding and loosing. Neither can it be assumed that Peter is here conceived as the gatekeeper who can grant or withhold entrance to heaven. Nothing is said of a key in the singular, but of a bunch of keys. The bunch of keys, as appears from Isaiah xxii. 22 and Rev. iii. 7, and as H. L. Ahrens has correctly seen, is the badge of the steward. In Rev. iii. 7 Jesus is Himself the steward as major domo. In Matthew xvi. 19 it is Peter, and this by virtue of his authority to teach in the kingdom of God, as one who deals out spiritual bread according to his judgment from the store at his command (xxiv. 45). The kingdom of God, or, as Matthew says, of heaven, is of course here the Christian community, hence something quite other than the " heaven " which is opposed to " earth " in the second part of our verse.[1]

To underestimate the scope and weight of this investiture of Peter with all the power and authority of those who sit in Moses' seat would be to show faithlessness to the principles of historical interpretation. The author means what he says. He looks to the decision of Peter on the question of what in the written law is or is not binding on the Christian (*cf.* v. 19) as supreme and final, and this to him is the second great debt owed by the Church to the " first " of the Apostles.

[1] *Das Evangelium Matthaei*, p. 85.

He who first stablished it on the rock of the resurrection faith is the same who also determined for it its standard of duty, what of the given "commandments" might be considered "loosed" and what as "bound."

We who come to our knowledge of Christianity through the Pauline Epistles, and who read even the Book of Acts as if its author occupied the Pauline viewpoint, find it next to impossible to realise that for the author of Acts, as well as for the first evangelist, it is not Paul but *Peter* who settles the great and critical question of the first generation of the Church, the question of the obligation of the Mosaic law. In the first raising of the issue in Acts x. 1–xi. 18 it is Peter who receives and defends the revelation abolishing "distinctions of meats." Again it is Peter who, when the attempt is made by the Judaisers to impose circumcision and obedience to the law on Gentile converts declares himself the divinely appointed Apostle to the Gentiles (!), and champions their liberty (Acts xv. 7–11). Paul, although present to testify as to the success of his work, has not a word to say on the vital point of binding or loosing from the requirements of the law. He and Barnabas gladly accept the decrees enacted at the instance of Peter with the support of James and the Elders. Paul and Barnabas merely distribute them to the Gentile churches "for to keep." Of course the Pauline Epistles make it impossible to accept this view of the history. From them we know beyond question that the rôle here assigned to Peter belongs rightfully only to Paul. It was Paul, not Peter, who was the divinely appointed Apostle to the Gentiles. It was Paul, not Peter, who found the law "a yoke which neither we nor our fathers were able to bear," and insisted not only that it should not be imposed on Gentile converts, but that *Jews also* cut themselves off from Christ and made His death in vain, if after having sought to be justified by faith in Christ

and not by works of law, they turned back to rebuild shattered walls of partition between themselves and "sinners of the Gentiles." But because *we* are aware from the Epistles that the representation of Acts is incorrect we should not ignore the fact that in the region and time of origin of the Book of Acts the course of events had come to be so understood. Not only had Peter taken the place of Paul as the divinely appointed Apostle to the Gentiles and the victorious champion of liberty from the yoke of Mosaism against the Pharisaically minded, but, as critics long since recognised, the whole traditional career of Peter in the first half of Acts is assimilated to the more historical outline of the career of Paul in the second. An extraordinary parallelism thus runs throughout the book, extending even to incidents of healing and miracle.

This tendency to expropriate Paul in the interest of the Galilean Apostles with Peter as their representative does not begin with Acts or Matthew. So early a writing as First Peter (*ca.* 90) not only takes under the wing of the chief Apostle the whole of Paul's distinctive mission field, "Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia, but even appropriates his lieutenants, Silvanus and Mark. What part has Paul to play in the eyes of a Papias in Hierapolis; or of a Justin at Rome in 140–155 A.D.? To place ourselves at the point of view of Acts, or of Matthew, we must read, just as their authors write, practically as if there never had been any Pauline Epistles at all. Once this is done Peter comes to his own—or rather to that which the Church had begun to attribute to him wherever the name of Paul was unknown or forgotten.

From this point of view the writer of our first canonical Gospel again corrects the representation of Mark (a Roman Gospel). His first care is to prefix to the account of Jesus' Rebuke of Peter for "minding not the things of God, but the

things of men" a preliminary Blessing as founder of the Church on the resurrection faith. Thereafter he appends a divine Authorisation to settle for the Church the burning question of the Yoke of the Law.

And Simon Peter answered and said, Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God. And Jesus answered and said unto him, Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-Jonah: for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven. And I also say unto thee that thou art Peter, and upon this rock (πέτρα) I will build My church; and the gates of Hades shall not prevail against it. I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven.

3. A third *midrashic* supplement is prefixed by our first evangelist in Matthew xvii. 24–27 to his transcript of the Markan chapter on Receiving and Stumbling (Mark ix. 30–50=Matt. xviii.) At first sight the anecdote might seem to owe its position simply to the opening clause of the last verse: "Lest we cause them to stumble," whose relation to xviii. 6–9 is self-evident. But a second glance shows that this is at least not the only connexion, In the supplement Peter appears again in the special relation with Jesus exhibited in the two which have preceded. He is the representative of the Twelve who stands between them and the Lord. He is the steward, the major domo of Christ's household.[1] The ensuing section deals with the administration of this stewardship, beginning with the principle of greatness in the kingdom, continuing with rules of order and government, rules for receiving, excluding, reclaiming of members, settlement of divisions, "binding and loosing" and the like, and concludes with Peter's question on the

[1] Cf. Wellhausen, *Ev. d. Matthaei*, p. 90. "Jesus lässt die Steuer für sich und Petrus entrichten, die anderen Jünger kommen nicht in Betracht. Petrus ist wie in xvi. 17–19 sein Alter Ego und das Vorbild der ganzen Gemeinde; die Zolleinnehmer wenden sich an ihn und er ist auch der Zahlende."

limits of forgiveness and the Lord's answer. To such an agglutination the anecdote of Jesus' direction to Peter how to meet the demands of the Jewish collector of the half-shekel for the temple forms no inappropriate preface. What concerns us, however, is the bearing and application[1] of the story. What problem of interest to the Church is it supposed to solve, and why is Peter's part made so prominent ?

According to Allen, who represents the usual view, the anecdote is

> a product of the early days of the Palestinian Church, when Jews and Jewish Christians were falling apart, and when the question, whether Jewish Christians, who were ceasing to use the Temple for worship, could conscientiously continue to pay the Temple-tax was becoming a subject of controversy. But, in any case, the narrative reflects the circumstances of the Jewish-Christian Society in the period before the fall of Jerusalem, and it must therefore be early in date.

In spite of the weighty support of Wellhausen we shall venture to question this early dating of the *midrashic* anecdote, and to maintain that in date as well as in character and style, in scope and learning, as well as in Jewish-Christian interest, it is much more closely related to the other Petrine supplements (whose horizon is by no means the narrow one of " the early days of the Palestinian Church " but more nearly that of Acts or even of Hegesippus) than to Mark or the Second Source.

We may accept Allen's statement of the assumed situation.

> The Jews pay the tax to the Temple. They inquire if Christ and His disciples will pay it also. In his answer Christ seems to draw a distinction between His disciples, who in a true sense are sons of the Heavenly King, and the non-Christian Jews who are really aliens.[2]

What the commentator fails to notice is what Kreyen-

[1] *Intern. Crit. Comm.*, p. 314.
[2] *Ibid.*

bühl has pointed out in the case of the preceding supplement, the handling of a Pauline question with the echo of Pauline phraseology and something like a reversal of the Pauline point of view.

Few things can be more distinctive of Paul than the principle of the freedom of sons,[1] which nevertheless is limited by the obligation to avoid " occasions of stumbling." The connexion of the third Petrine supplement with the chapter on Occasions of Stumbling and the phraseology employed show that the purpose of its introduction is to illustrate this principle. Only, those who are liable to be stumbled by the exercise of a liberty in itself justifiable are no longer the " weak " brethren. They are not even as in Acts xv. 1 f., xxi. 20–26 the Jews of the Pharisees who have believed and who must be conciliated. It is now the veritable Israel of the circumcision, the devotees of the temple itself, whose stumbling at Christian liberty must be met. The principle invoked is the Pauline principle of accommodation and it is applied without reserve. But the Apostle who applies it is Peter (!); and the application would probably have been a surprise to Paul.

It has been a favourite argument of the apologists for the traditional early date of Matthew that the motive for the anecdote of the collection of the half-shekel implies a date anterior to the destruction of the temple, after which the tax was collected by Roman agents and diverted to other purposes. Even a Wellhausen has been so impressed by this argument as to date the origin of the story—though not its inclusion in the Gospel of Matthew—before 70 A.D.[2]

[1] Gal. iv. 21–v. 1 should be compared with its later development in John viii. 31–40.

[2] *Op. cit.* p. 90. " Wichtig ist, dass auch diese Geschichte, die man für sehr spät hält, doch vor der Zerstörung des Tempels entstanden sein muss, wenngleich darum nicht schon zu Lebzeiten des Petrus."

Yes, if the motive be indeed so narrow. But is it true that the author aims at nothing wider than

> the question whether the Palestinian Christians, the real υἱοί and ἐλεύθεροι, citizens of the true kingdom of God, shall continue, after as before, the payment of the temple-tax ? [1]

Is a refusal by Palestinian Christians to pay this *Roman* tax likely to have been an " occasion of stumbling " to their Jewish brethren ? May we not more justly regard the instance as measurably parallel to that of the census-money, whereby Jesus is challenged to prove His loyalty or disloyalty to Caesar ? Is it not intended, in short, to be a *typical* case, wherein Peter applies the Pauline principle of the self-restriction of the freedom of sons to avoid " occasions of stumbling " ? If so, we need feel no surprise that the narrator commits no anachronism, but presupposes conditions as they were in the time of Jesus, before the overthrow of the temple. This is characteristic of Talmudic authorities, centuries later, who still preserve the same sense of historical fitness in matters concerning the temple administration. The Christian narrator is also aware (or assumes) that " the half-shekel for the sanctuary " of Exodus xxx. 13 was paid in the time of Jesus' ministry.

As we have seen, the setting of the incident is not accidental. It prefaces the chapter on Church administration because it is intended to settle one of the great problems of the Church universal considered as a unit under the direction of Peter as the steward of Christ. The problem concerns the relations of the Christian community not to the Roman world, but to orthodox Judaism, the Judaism of Palestine. It is not essentially different from that confronted by the author of Acts who tries to remove the stumblingblock occasioned by Pauline renunciation of the " yoke of the law " to the " many myriads of the Jews which

[1] *Ibid.*

believe, all of whom are zealots for the law." According to Acts xxi. 17–26 the outcome of Paul's great peace-making mission to Jerusalem was that on suggestion of "James and the elders" Paul took the four men under a Nazirite vow,

> and the next day, purifying himself with them, went into the temple, declaring the fulfilment of the days of purification, until the offering was offered for every one of them.

The *act* was a perfectly possible one under Paul's principle of accommodation in view of the complete *nullity* of the law. We have no right to question his having performed it, however ill-advised it may have proved, whether as to exhibiting Paul's true attitude towards the law among his Christian friends, or as appeasing the wrath of his Jewish enemies, who could not be blinded as to the real nature of his teaching and would only be infuriated by what in their eyes would be sheer mockery.

But Acts does not hold with Paul that "circumcision is nothing." On the contrary, as Acts understands the principle of accommodation, Paul and all the rest of "the Jews which are among the Gentiles" are under strictest obligation to "walk orderly keeping the law." They must continue to circumcise their children and walk after the customs. The Galatian question according to Acts was settled by two things: (*a*) the promulgation of the Apostolic Decrees, defining what is bound and what is loosed (Acts xvi. 4); (*b*) the circumcision of Timothy at Lystra, whom Paul "took and circumcised because of the Jews that were in those parts." So in the larger instance at Jerusalem the act in the temple was intended

> that all may know that there is no truth in the things whereof they have been informed concerning thee, but that thou thyself also walkest orderly, keeping the law.

The *motive* here assigned to Paul's act is a perfectly im-

possible one under the whole principle and practice of Pauline liberty.

Matthew also has its principle of new authority in the Church (xviii. 18) and specifically in Peter (xvi. 19) to "bind and loose." It has its principle of the freedom of sons, and its principle of accommodation in the application of this doctrine of liberty to the specific case of the "stumbling occasioned to the Jews.[1] The instance cannot, of course, any longer be the *cause célèbre* of Paul's action with the Nazirites in the temple. It must be found among the experiences of Jesus with Peter and the Twelve. Were they loyal or disloyal to the temple and its services? Did they, because they claimed the freedom of sons, claim also exemption from the burdens of the sanctuary and the law? The answer of the Palestinian evangelist is the *midrashic* prefix to the chapter on occasions of stumbling, and administration of the Church.

When they were come to Capernaum, they that received the half-shekel (tribute to the temple) came to Peter, and said, Doth not your master pay the half-shekel? He saith, Yea. And when he came into the house, Jesus spake first to him, saying, What thinkest thou, Simon? The kings of the earth, from whom do they receive toll or tribute? from their sons, or from strangers? And when he said, From strangers, Jesus said unto him, Therefore the sons are free. But, lest we cause them to stumble, go thou to the sea and cast a hook, and take up the fish that first cometh up; and when thou hast opened his mouth thou shalt find a shekel. That take and give unto them for me and thee.

We learn more from the Book of Acts when we do not fetter our interpretation by the dogmatic rule that its author must always have agreed with Paul. We learn more of the obscure period after the Pauline letters when we allow ourselves to realise that to a considerable extent the strictly historical view of events gave way to a process of

[1] The "stumbling" of the *Pharisees* (Matt. xv. 12) by Christian rejection of the "traditions" in xv. 12–20 is another matter.

idealisation in which the figure of Peter in the full blaze of direct association with Jesus, came rapidly to eclipse the only quasi-apostolic figure of Paul. One of the things, however, which the largely idealised story of Acts can most surely teach us is to know what things were counted the vital achievements during the great period it covers from the founding of the Church to the establishment of a free Gentile Church, not hostile, but in brotherly relations with the Church of " the Apostles and elders in Jerusalem." Surely to the author of Acts the great stages in the history of the Church are but three : (1) its founding on the rock of the resurrection faith, through the instrumentality of Peter, though the actual story of Peter's turning again has disappeared ; (2) the enactment of the Apostolic Decrees which determine for the world-wide Church and for all time what shall be bound and loosed of the Mosaic law ; (3) the great application by Paul at Jerusalem of the principle of accommodation by which the occasion of stumbling is removed between Jewish and Gentile believers.

Gospels which were written without expectation of their being followed by a Book of Acts had to bring the principles by which these problems were solved within their compass as best they could. The accepted method of the synagogue to meet this requirement is the symbolic tale (*haggada*), which under the form of edifying legend carries back to the period of authoritative revelation the practical problems of the narrator's time. As we have seen, the three Matthaean supplements to the Markan story of Peter have as their motive problems of the apostolic age not essentially different from those whose solution occupies our Book of Acts. In any gospel consideration of such themes must take the *haggadic* form. In a Jewish-Christian gospel it would inevitably take the form of revelation through Peter, not the earlier and more authentic form of a develop-

ment starting from an Apostleship of the circumcision committed to Peter and culminating in an apostleship of the Gentiles committed unto Paul. Those who best know the principles and methods of Jewish *haggada* and *midrash* will be least disposed to doubt the sufficiency of these to account for the three Petrine supplements of Matthew.

B. W. Bacon.

THE STAR IN THE EAST.

II.

Ephrem Syrus, in his comment on the Song of Zacharias, says that "the *dayspring* (*anatolè*) from on high" signifies "the Star of the Magi." [1] This raises a question about Luke, whether he, in recording this Song, had Matthew's story of the Magi in view. On Luke's next words ("them that were sitting in darkness and in the shadow of death") Ephrem proceeds to comment as follows:

"This was said (1) about the Magi, because, before the rising of the Star, they were aliens from the true religion. Or [it may be said] (2) about *Israelites that were in darkness*, for the Magi enlightened them [about the birth of the King of the *Jews*], wherefore also he [*i.e.* Zacharias] says, 'To guide *our feet* [2] into the ways of peace.'" Then comes a third (and perhaps a fourth) interpretation—that "sitting in the shadow [of death]" may refer to "the astrology of the Chaldeans," or to "the shadow of the idolatry of the Gentiles."

Ephrem's reference to "Israelites that were in darkness" adds reasonableness to the question raised above. For surely it is reasonable to ask, "Why did not Matthew tell us something about the first manifestation of the infant

[1] Ephrem, ed. Moesinger, p. 20.

[2] "*Our* feet," *i.e.* the feet of us, the "Israelites."

Saviour to His own countrymen ? Why record nothing but a manifestation to foreigners from the East—and that many months after His birth ? Matthew gives the genealogy of the Child and records events immediately before the birth. Why, then, omit the first important event that followed after it ? " And from this we pass to another reasonable question, " Would not Luke, who wrote about events ' from the beginning,' endeavour to supply this deficiency, and by what means, if by any, did he attempt to supply it ? Is there in Luke any manifestation of the Infant Saviour to Israelites corresponding to Matthew's account of the manifestation to the Magi ? "

There is, of course, the manifestation to the Shepherds near Bethlehem. But this appears, at first sight, not to correspond at all—not at least so far as concerns the most prominent object in Matthew's picture, the Star. For there is no " star " in Luke. There is, however, " a multitude of the heavenly host," Now in Scripture " the heavenly host," or " host of heaven," frequently means the stars. And we have found that Ignatius, the earliest commentator on Matthew's Star, describes the sun and moon and the other stars *making a "chorus" around it.* He is referring merely to Matthew, not to Luke ; yet his language agrees with the Lucan picture of an " angel " along with " a multitude of the heavenly host," that is, a leading Star along with lesser luminaries. And the " chorus " in Ignatius may fairly be said to resemble the song of the " host " that " praises God " in Luke.

There is therefore a *prima facie* case for supposing that Luke's Story of the Shepherds is written with some reference to Matthew, and with the view of supplementing Matthew's story by adding an account of another " guidance " of believers to the cradle of the new-born Messiah. The Magi desire to be guided to " the King of the Jews." The

Angel uses to the shepherds a different title, "Saviour, who is Messiah, Lord." The former title brought massacre and desolation to innocent children; the proclamation of the latter was accompanied by a proclamation of "peace on earth among men in whom God is well pleased." It is difficult to believe that Luke did not feel this antithesis and wish his readers to feel it.

In the same way when we read of the *anatolè*, meaning "dayspring," in Luke's Introduction, and remember the difficulties surrounding the local use of *anatolè*, or "east," in Matthew's Introduction, we are led to think of the Lucan use of the word as significant. It seems to put aside discussions of locality, and to fasten on the spiritual meaning, that of illuminating guidance to the source of Peace. Elsewhere Luke makes us realise the craving for such guidance by bringing before us not only Zacharias, but also Simeon and Anna, both of them in suspense, both waiting for some redemption, some "consolation of Israel," and watching for it, as the Psalmist says, "more than watchmen look for the morning." [1]

We ought not to suppose that these Songs of Watchers, as they might be called, are mere Lucan poems, artistic compositions in Septuagint Greek. It is far more probable that there were current many such songs in the early Jewish Church of Christ, and that there were really many such pious souls "waiting for the Lord." Their "waiting" would be based on Scripture. In answer to the question, "Where is the Messiah to be born?" they would reply from Scripture, "In Bethlehem." In answer to the question "When is He to be born?" they would have no correspondingly exact scriptural reply satisfying curiosity by specifying a date in years, or months. But they would find some kind of reply that would serve for poetic needs

[1] Ps. cxxx. 6.

in the Messianic Psalm that describes a mysterious Mediator as "a priest for ever, after the order of Melchizedek." It says, according to the Hebrew, "*From the womb of the morning* thou hast the dew of thy youth," but according to the LXX, "*from the womb, before the morning-star*, I begot thee."[1]

Let us suppose—it is not a very far-fetched supposition—that "*before the morning-star*" was introduced at an early date into Christian hymnology celebrating the Saviour's birth. The phrase could hardly fail to call up for devout readers of the Scriptures the thought of the Day of Creation, when "the morning stars sang together and all the sons of God shouted for joy."[2] The LXX renders this, "When the stars were created all my angels praised me with a loud voice," thus destroying the personality of the stars. But the Targum on Job retains that personality. At the same time, the Psalmist's words "*before the morning-star*," if applied literally to those who were waiting for the Lord, might naturally be thought to designate the shepherds near Bethlehem watching their sheep by night. Micah's prophecy about the Birth, as quoted by Matthew, said: "And thou Bethlehem, land of Judah, . . . out of thee shall come forth a Leader, who shall *shepherd* my people, Israel."[3] Luke after describing the arrival of the parents of Jesus at "the city of David which is called Bethlehem," and then the Birth of the Babe, might see an appropriateness in the following description of those to whom He was to be manifested: "There were *shepherds* in that same place, abiding in the fields and watching through the night-watches over their flock."[4] Shepherds were chosen as the class representative of those faithful and expectant Israelites to whom would be granted the first manifestation of the newborn Shepherd of Israel.

[1] Ps. cx. 3. [2] Job xxxviii. 7.
[3] Matt. ii. 6, loosely quoting Mic. v. 2. [4] Luke ii. 4, 8.

Clement of Alexandria refers neither to Matthew nor to Luke. Yet he helps us to see the Jewish thought at the bottom of both narratives, and also to understand its Johannine development, when he describes the harmony of the Universe as a Song of Salvation both old and new. "Do not suppose," he says, "that the Song of Salvation is new in the same sense in which a vessel or house is new. For '*Before the morning-star it was,*' and '*In the beginning was the Word . . . and the Word was God.*'" It was a New Song, he implies, in respect of the new revelation of the Logos, under the name Christ, under which name God offered deliverance to those who were under servitude to "the wicked serpent," bidding them to "flee from the prince of the power of the air" and "run to the Lord, the Saviour." [1] This resembles the mission of the New Star in Matthew, the Star of War, as interpreted by early Christian writers. On the other hand, it was not new, but old, in Luke and John. It denoted the Song of the old familiar "morning-star," the Star of Peace, singing of that which had come to pass "before" its rising, or "before" its creation, in the beginning of things.

Milton also may be called in to testify to the poetic resemblance between the vocal announcement of the Angel to the shepherds in Luke and the silent announcement of the Star to the Magi in Matthew. Milton's Hymn on the Nativity deals only with the shepherds. The Magi, "the star-led wizards," are recognised, in the Introductory Ode, as being at present far away, "upon the eastern road," but are not mentioned in the Hymn. We might therefore expect to find in the Hymn no mention of stars, nothing but angels or "the host of heaven":—

> "The helmed cherubim
> And sworded seraphim
> Are seen in glittering ranks with wings display'd,

[1] Clem. Alex. pp. 6, 7.

Harping in loud and solemn quire
With unexpressive notes to Heaven's new-born Heir."

But, even before this, the stars appear in the picture :—

"The stars, with deep amaze,
Stand fix'd in steadfast gaze,
Bending one way their precious influence :
And will not take their flight
For all the morning light,
Or Lucifer, that often warn'd them thence."

And how naturally the poem passes on from "the helmed cherubim and sworded seraphim" to "constellations," and to the Day of Creation when "the morning stars sang together" :

"Such music, as 'tis said,
Before was never made,
But when of old the sons of morning sung,
While the Creator great
His constellations set,
And the well-balanced world on hinges hung,
And cast the dark foundations deep,
And bid the weltering waves their oozy channel keep."

We are not then to conclude that Luke simply desired as a historian to substitute his account of an epiphany to shepherds for Matthew's account of an epiphany to Magi. It would be truer to say that he desired to supplement, and, in supplementing, to correct a false impression. He desired to dissipate unfavourable inferences that might be drawn by Roman officials about the political aspirations of Jewish Christians, if the latter seemed to be playing into the hands of disaffected Galilæans by indulging in thoughts about the triumph of "the Star of the King of the Jews" in the East, as opposed to "the star of Cæsar" in the West. But further, he felt other and deeper promptings. He wrote as a poet, alive to the affinity between light and harmony; and as a Christian poet, imbued with the belief that light and harmony were united in Christ. And lastly, both as a histor-

ian and as a poet, he was keenly alive to the spiritual paradox that, at the time when he wrote his Gospel, the only account of the manifestation of the new-born Saviour whom Christians worshipped as the Prince of Peace made no mention whatever of "peace," but described a murder of infants in Bethlehem that left "Rachel mourning for her children because they were not."

E. A. Abbott.

JEWISH COINS AND MESSIANIC TRADITIONS.

A Reply to Dr. Gaster.

The article upon this subject by Dr. Moses Gaster ought not to be allowed to pass unchallenged upon numismatic grounds.

His argument, ingenious in itself and supported, as one would expect from so eminent a scholar, by a wealth of illustration, unfortunately falls to the ground in the light of modern numismatic research, with which Dr. Gaster does not appear to be acquainted. Whether, indeed, it can even be sustained upon the evidence which Madden and Reinach, who are Dr. Gaster's own choice of authorities, collected, is at least a moot point, but certainly Mr. G. F. Hill's exhaustive catalogue of the unrivalled collection (including both the Wigan and Hamburger specimens) now in the British Museum, definitely disposes of it.

Dr. Gaster's argument involves two propositions, neither of which, I hope to show, are in any way tenable.

"There can scarcely now," are his concluding words, "be any doubt that the types on the Jewish coins can only be the pot of manna and the blossoming rod of Aaron, and that we have in them types of a Messianic character of the time of Simon Bar Kochba."

To take the former of these first, Dr. Gaster assures us

that "the opinion of most scholars gravitates to the conclusion" that this is the case, but he omits to tell us that neither Madden nor Reinach support the statement.

Madden [1] describes the obverse type as "a cup or chalice, ornamented with jewels," and the reverse type even more modestly as "a central device (? Aaron's rod)."

Reinach [2] is equally far from encouraging Dr. Gaster, for he says, "The types are, on the obverse a jewelled cup or chalice, on the reverse a branch of lily with three flowers," and he is careful to add a footnote, obviously implying that he rejected the opinion, "Earlier nimismatists described the types as 'a pot of manna' and 'Aaron's rod budding.'"

Mr. Hill's [3] assurance does not carry him any further, and he speaks of "a chalice . . . with pearled rim" and a "Stem with three flowers," forced to be content with this vague description.

I [4] made an attempt to be more definite in a paper entitled "Types of the Jewish Shekels" read to the Royal Numismatic Society on November 17, 1910, and printed in its Chronicle during the following year. In that paper, like Madden and Reinach, I attributed the coins to Simon the Maccabee, and suggested that he, as a patriotic Jew, who in the face of the second Commandment would shrink from placing his own portrait upon the coins, adopted "a canting device," and used a spring flower, a lily or a rhododendron to represent his surname, *Θασσί* [5]—the burst of Spring, thus interpreting the words of 1 Maccabees xv. 5, 6 (*ἐπέτρεψά σοι ποιῆσαι κόμμα ἴδιον νόμισμα τῇ χώρᾳ σου*) I am bound to confess that Mr. Hill cannot agree with

[1] F. W. Madden, *Coins of the Jews*, 1881, pp. 67–69.

[2] Théodore Reinach, *Jewish Coins*, translated by Mary Hill, 1903, pp. 10, 11.

[3] *Catalogue of Greek Coins in The British Museum, Palestine*, by G. F. Hill, 1914, pp. 269–270.

[4] *Numismatic Chronicle*, 1911, Part 1. Fourth Series, No. 41, pp. 1–5.

[5] 1 Macc. ii. 3.

this, as being too conjectural, although there is nothing inherently impossible in such a "picture-play," as many a similar verbalism is familiar to scholars of Hebrew literature, and perhaps it will be sufficient here to instance the famous play upon words between קִיץ and קֵץ in Amos viii. 1, 2. It is a curious coincidence in view of the present discussion that the false Messiah placed a star in a like "canting" fashion upon his coins to assert his claim to the Son of a Star.

Dr. Gaster, having made up his mind that the types represent indeed the pot of manna and the rod of Aaron, is quite sure that "the meaning attached to those emblems has nothing whatever to do with the Aaronite descent."

He then at some length shews the essentially Messianic character of these two objects from the legends and traditions clustering around them. "He, who struck the coins," he adds, "selected these two objects in order to shew that he was the real Messiah."

This, of course, was not the case with Simon the Maccabee. Dr. Gaster appositely quotes 1 Maccabees xiv. 41, "The Jews and Priests were well pleased that Simon should be their governour and high priest for ever until there should arrive a faithful prophet."

Dr. Gaster agrees that "the people recognised Simon and his descendants to be the high priest only."

No one would quarrel with that. Certainly if the types are Messianic the coins do not belong to Simon the Maccabee, and Dr. Gaster is right to try and find some one else as their originator. He chooses Simon Bar Kochba, and later on I propose to give my arguments against this choice. For the moment the right interpretation of the types is the point.

Dr. Gaster, in defence of his pot of manna and Aaron rod theory, realising that any other interpretation would

be fatal to his whole thesis, is very emphatic. "It would have been more appropriate if stress was to have been laid on the Aaronite descent, if, for example, such a conspicuous vestment as the breastplate would have been chosen with the mystical precious stones, or the mitre, or any other emblem seen by the multitude and worn by the High Priest in the sight of the assembly, e.g. on the Day of Atonement and other occasions of public and religious rejoicing. It would have brought home to the people the fact that now they enjoyed absolute freedom in the performance of such duties and ceremonies."

With that I agree. It exactly expresses the state of affairs under Simon the Maccabee, and is a happy comment on the promise of Antiochus to Simon as recorded in 1 Maccabees xv. 6, 7: "I give thee leave . . . that Jerusalem and the sanctuary should be free" (*Ἱερουσαλὴμ δὲ καὶ τα ἅγια εἶναι ἐλεύθερα*).

If the types could be shewn to bear a priestly significance, keeping in mind the high priestly claim of Simon, the facts would fit in much better than they can by the wildest stretch of the imagination be made to do in the case of Bar Kochba.

That was largely my point in the interpretation which I submitted to the Royal Numismatic Society. Leaving for a moment "the canting device," I described Dr. Gaster's pot of manna as a golden chalice. There was in my mind the imagery of Ecclesiasticus L. 6–9, 14, 15.

"He was as the morning star in the midst of a cloud . . . and as the flower of roses in the spring of the year, as lilies by the rivers of waters . . . as a vessel of beaten gold set about with all manner of precious stones. . . . He stretched out his hand to the cup and poured of the blood of the grape, he poured out at the foot of the altar a sweet-smelling savour unto the most high King of all."

It is a description of Simon, the son of Onias, the great (R.V. margin high) priest, who might well have been taken as his model by Simon the Maccabee.

"The vessel of beaten gold set about with all manner of precious stones" is an accurate description of what appears on the coins and would be an easily recognisable priestly emblem, which at once satisfies Dr. Gaster's criterion.

It is here worth noting how hard driven Dr. Gaster is to make good his theory. The object on the shekels is a cup or chalice (jewelled or unjewelled), and as unlike an earthenware pot, which Dr. Gaster points out the pot of manna must have been, as is possible. Surely such a pot must have had a cover, and in fact a probable representation of the pot of manna, cover and all, is to be found on a copper coin [1] attributed to the First Revolt and dated the "year three." It bears the legend, Leherut Zion, just as the coins of Simon Bar Kochba bear the legends Leherut Yerushalaim or Leherut Yisrael or Lige'ullath Yisrael, with obvious reference to the Messianic purpose of their issuer, while these shekels under question have as legend only "Jerusalem the Holy" (ירושלים הקדושה),[2] which would appropriately be used by such a Priest-King as Simon the Maccabee was, but has no direct Messianic reference at all.

Dr. Gaster's devotion to Aaron's rod and the pot of manna lead him to the most fantastic numismatic exegesis, which is only worth noticing, because he drags it in to support his argument. "We can shew," he says, "a definite persistence of the type in many variations and remarkable applications. They will go a long way to corroborate the right to assume that the cup or chalice represented the pot of manna. But I will go a step further. However numerous

[1] Hill, *B. M. Catalogue*, p. 274, Nos. 42–53.

[2] Is it too much to see in this the Hebrew equivalent of Ἱερουσαλὴμ δὲ καὶ τὰ ἅγια ?

the changes may have been on the coins, the pot or chalice seems to have been retained on almost every one of them, but sometimes the rod is placed near the pot. Some people have been inclined to interpret it as a palm, I am inclined to see in it a budding rod. The design does not agree with that of a palm leaf, but it agrees much more with a budding and blossoming rod."

Dr. Gaster is difficult to follow in this. Except for the pot of manna, to which I have already referred as being upon the copper coin of the First Revolt, and a very Greek-looking diota on one of the small copper coins of the Procurator Valerius Gratus, which surely cannot be the pot of manna, nothing in the shape of a pot appears from Maccabean times until the Second Revolt, and the pot then has contrived to deceive all numismatic students into believing it is a jug or pitcher, to which with its lip, its single handle and foot, the mere man in the street might be forgiven for thinking it singularly like.

It is the same with the palm branch, which Dr. Gaster finds " an attempt at describing a budding and blossoming rod." It rarely occurs. Two palm branches are found upon one of the types of the copper of Herod the Great. A coin of Herod Antipas, struck at Tiberias, presents one, the Procurators Valerius Gratus and Porcius Festus do so : but it is surely difficult in these cases to see any reference to Messianic tradition, especially when another Procurator, Felix, uses crossed palm branches.

Once more the palm branch does not occur until the Second Revolt, and even then seems innocent of masquerading as Aaron's rod. It is a very definite palm branch, and if it had not occurred on one overstruck denarius side by side with the jug or pitcher, it could surely never have been mistaken by Dr. Gaster for Aaron's rod with the pot of manna. Rather it is a single branch of the palm tree that

is so common upon the copper of the Second Revolt, just as it is in Seleucid days upon the semi-autonomous coinage of Tyre. One almost fears that Dr. Gaster will see in the palm tree on the Jewish coins an attempt at describing a budding and blossoming rod. If he does he will then be face to face with the difficulty of two Messiahs, Eleazar the Priest and Simon the Prince (Nasi), both presenting their claim at the same time.

The natural explanation is much sounder. A pitcher is a pitcher and a pot with a cover the pot of manna, if you like, but the chalice upon the Maccabean shekels "a vessel of beaten gold, set about with all manner of precious stones."

With one type, then, and the legend easily resolvable into the emblem of "Aaronite descent," it is worth while further to examine the device.

I am indebted to Dr. Gaster for crystallising an idea which has long floated too vaguely in my mind, and I am tempted to develop it here, because it has a direct bearing upon the point at issue between us.

Professor Flinders Petrie [1] first suggested it to me while reading his book, *Egypt and Israel*. In the chapter on the Period of Judges, discussing the influence of Egypt upon the religion of Israel, he says: "Another Egyptian model is seen in the border of the high priest's robe, which had a golden bell and a pomegranate alternately round the hem. This is the lotus border of flowers and seed vessels, which the Egyptians often used; only, as the lotus was unknown in Palestine, it was renamed by popular custom, much as the Greeks, in borrowing it, turned it into the palmetto." Dr. Flinders Petrie provides an illustration, which brings out the extraordinary resemblance to the three flower spikes of the central device of the coins under discussion.

[1] W. M. Flinders Petrie, *Egypt and Israel*, 1911, pp. 61, 62, and illustration to face p. 62.

Here, then, is an interpretation of the type, which violates no historical setting of the facts, far more probable than Dr. Gaster's. The device is not "Aaron's rod," but the "bells of gold" (פעמני זהב) of Exodus xxviii. 33, 34, or xxxix. 25, 26. The form, no doubt, is conventionalised and even confused in the mind of the Jew, but no more so, let us say, than the fleur de lys in the arms of France. A similar ornamentation of lotus flower, there called "lily work" (מעשה שושן), decorated the top of the pillars in Solomon's Temple, wrought by the Phœnician workman, Hiram of Tyre (1 Kings vii. 22), or in the case of the rim of the "brazen sea," called "flowers of lily" (פרח שושן), 1 Kings vii. 26). It is difficult in all this not to see a closer resemblance to the device upon the shekels which is obviously of the lily or lotus form than the idea of "Aaron's rod" allows, which, according to Numbers xvii. 8, "bloomed blossoms and yielded *almonds!*"

That in the process of conventionalising, the "lotus-bell" on the shekels should have acquired a triple form, need cause no surprise or difficulty. The mystical appropriation of the number three to represent completion is common throughout Hebrew literature. Two examples will here be sufficient. There is the triple offering of the Nazarite, typical of the whole-heartedness of his consecration (Num. vi. 14), and more noteworthy still the triple priestly blessing, which Aaron himself is to bestow (Num. vi. 24–26), while for a triple repetition there is the invocation of Isaiah vi. 3, "Holy, holy, holy, etc.," or the triple appeal of Jeremiah, "O earth, earth, earth, hear the word of the Lord" (Jer. xxii. 29).

The triple bell, lily or lotus device might well be recognisable as a representative emblem of the High Priest, and would not be "apparently meaningless symbols."

A golden bell and a golden chalice upon the coins and

there you have just the necessary priestly symbols, significant of the "Aaronite descent" and surely enough to give Dr. Gaster furiously to think, before he is too certain that "these symbols conveyed to the people a totally different impression."

What adds even further likelihood to this suggestion is the fact that there exists a half chalcous [1] of Antiochus VII., Sidetes. This little copper coin has a very distinct lotus flower on its obverse. As it is dated *AΠP* and *BΠP*, that is the years 181 and 182 of the era of the Seleucids, or B.C. 132 and 131, its issue coincides with the visit of Antiochus to Jerusalem to make an alliance with John Hyrcanus, the successor of Simon the Maccabee, and its place of issue is the Holy City. The flower is exactly similar to one of the three spikes upon the shekels.

Its issue would follow immediately upon them, and sufficiently answers the objection which Dr. Gaster urges that none of Simon's successors used the type. Quite apart from the fact that it is the rule rather than the exception for the types of copper coins to differ from silver, here is a valid reason. Perhaps in passing it ought to be remarked that those numismatists who hold the Maccabean origin of these coins attribute the one dated "Year five" to John Hyrcanus; and if there is any truth in the statement of 1 Maccabees xv. 27 that Antiochus revoked the right he had granted to Simon to strike monies, the course of Simon's successors is straightforward enough. Whatever else might be found upon these copper monies of the Hasmonean family, certainly neither a "canting device" nor a symbol, which could be referable to an official position, such as that of the High Priesthood, is to be expected; and the trivial nature of the types, olive wreath, cornucopiae, single

[1] E. Babelon, *Les Rois de Syrie*, 1890, p. cxliii., and E. Rogers, *A Handy Guide to Jewish Coins*, 1914, p. 24, No. 5.

flower (possibly lotus, which makes one doubt Dr. Gaster's intimate acquaintance with the series), anchor, star and palm, explain themselves.

So much, then, for Dr. Gaster's interpretation of the types, which for the above reasons, if for no other, cannot be "Aaron's rod" and "the pot of manna," but on the contrary are priestly symbols, which would seem to bear no Messianic reference at all.

Dr. Gaster's second proposition that the coins, presuming their Messianic reference, ought to be attributed to Simon Bar Kochba, is more astonishing still.

This is what he says, ". . . Bar Kochba raised the standard of revolt as a Jewish Messiah who fought for 'the freedom of Jerusalem, the deliverance of the people,'" and this is the legend of the coin Leherut Yerushalaim. The types of the pot of manna and the rod of Aaron fit admirably. With these symbols he came before the people. They understood the meaning of the types on the coins, and in a way he may have tried to impress also the Samaritans. He brought to them the same symbols as they postulated for the recognition of the true Messiah. The coins, therefore, which bear these types must be a sign to Simon Bar Kochba and not to Simon the Maccabee. Everything points in that direction. The difficulty about the years which are marked on the coins has not yet been solved in either case, but they fit in much better with the period of Bar Kochba than the time of Simon the Maccabee. Moreover, the lettering is absolutely identical between these coins, which are accepted as being coins of Bar Kochba, and those coins ascribed to Simon the Maccabee. A lapse of 250 years would have changed somewhat the characters, and yet they are absolutely identical. So from every point of view we are justified in ascribing them to Bar Kochba, and in seeing in these types the Messianic emblems."

Here Dr. Gaster fairly takes one's breath away ; but before I examine the main features of the argument there appear to be two smaller points which invite criticism.

Dr. Gaster's reference to the legend upon the coins appears to be confused. Leherut Yerushalaim, or for the matter of fact, any legend of a Messianic character, is not found upon them. It is, as I have already pointed out, as one of my reasons for controverting Dr. Gaster. The legend is always Yerushalam (i.e. with Yod omitted) kedoshah or Yerushalaim ha-kedoshah ; but perhaps Dr. Gaster means the true coins of Bar Kochba and not these shekels, in which case the confusion robs the argument of any point.

Secondly, the argument from epigraphy is singularly precarious. Dr. Gaster gives it an undue weight. What he calls the " palaeographic point of view " evidently appeals to him, because he twice urges it in his favour. True, on the face of it there should be considerable change in the character of the letters in 270 years, but the fact remains, as every student of Jewish coins knows, that the form of every letter on the latest coins of the series can readily be paralleled on the earliest, e.g., on those of John Hyrcanus or Aristobulus equally with those of Bar Kochba.

But the conclusive argument against the coins being attributed to Simon Bar Kochba is the existence of hundreds of coins, both silver and copper, entirely different from these shekels, which are indubitably attributed to the false Messiah. So numerous are they, that the classification of those in the British Museum occupies no less than sixty-eight pages of its Catalogue,[1] and is illustrated by seven pages of plates.

A glance at these illustrations in the B.M. Catalogue ought to convince the most elementary student of numismatics that the broad flat silver pieces of Simon Bar Kochba

[1] Hill, *B. M. C.* pp. 284–316. Plates xxxii–xxxviii inclusive.

are totally different from the style and fabric of these narrow dumpy shekels and half shekels in question.

One is here tempted to ask why it never occurred to Dr. Gaster to attribute them to the time of the First Revolt, and if he must have had a Simon as the issuer, why not Simon Bar Gioras? Many of the best numismatists, including Mr. Hill, do assign them to this Revolt.

However, Dr. Gaster prefers the Second Revolt, and therefore it is necessary, briefly, to criticise the attribution.

It means that Simon Bar Kochba issued two sets of coins simultaneously of quite a different character, fineness and possibly standard, though this last is too complicated a technicality to be thrashed out here with any profit. It further means that Simon Bar Kochba, with a singular perversity, dated one set consecutively from the year one to the year five and the other set, the year one or the year two, while he left others without any date at all.

Dr. Gaster considers evidently that this extraordinary proceeding is without difficulty, and says that the five years fit in better with the period of Simon Bar Kochba than with the time of Simon the Maccabée.

M. Reinach [1] has presented an entirely satisfactory solution of the dating, if the coins were issued by Simon the Maccabee and Mr. Hill [2] has ingeniously squeezed the years to fit the First Revolt; but Dr. Gaster has made no attempt to elucidate the puzzle in the case of Simon Bar Kochba, and it is difficult to see how five years can elapse between A.D. 132 and A.D. 135, and it is inconceivable that they should have been issued for two years after the ignominious defeat and death of Simon Bar Kochba.

Then there is the incontestable fact that all the coins of Simon Bar Kochba are overstruck. That is to say, he

[1] Reinach, op. cit. p. 17.
[2] Hill, *B.M. Catalogue*, p. xci.

used for his blanks coins already in circulation and heated up to receive the new impression from his dies, and an interesting example [1] exists in the British Museum Collection, which has been prepared for the re-striking by having the edges hammered up to prevent them splitting in the re-strike. This hammered-up edge is characteristic of the real coins of Simon Bar Kochba, and is quite different from the carefully executed edges of the shekels of a very distinct workmanship, for which a parallel, as for the fabric generally, is best to be found in the early autonomous shekels of Tyre.

The result of Simon's method is satisfactory from the point of view of attribution. The coins are mostly imperfectly struck, and the legends of the original coins are often easily legible. Tetradrachms of Antioch, denarii of Roman Emperors for the silver, coins of the Ptolemies or Roman colonial coins of such cities as Gaza, etc., are still recognisable beneath the Jewish type and make it quite certain when they were issued.

This necessity on the part of Simon Bar Kochba for re-striking is not far to seek. He had no ingots for blanks. The Temple and its treasure had been wiped out in A.D.70. The Romans did their work thoroughly, and Dr. Gaster needs hardly to be reminded that Josephus particularly remarks upon the amount of money and jewels which were discovered in the ruins of the Holy City. Simon adopted the obvious expedient of re-striking his own coinage upon any money which came to hand.

The exact opposite is the case with the shekels and half shekels which are under discussion. No overstruck examples have as yet been discovered. The surface upon them is good, the work careful and the finish accurate, while the quality of the silver employed is not variable as it is in the case of the nondescript blanks, which were the basis of the

[1] Hill, op. cit. Plate xxxiii. 4.

coinage of Simon Bar Kochba. Such an issue necessitates fresh blanks and not second-hand ones, and therefore presupposes the existence of silver ingots, which might have been possible in the days of Simon the Maccabee or of the First Revolt, but which was impossible in the days of Simon Bar Kochba, as his own coins incontestably prove.

A recent find at Jerusalem goes further still to clinch the argument, and every historical student as well as numismatist will admit the value of a find as evidence. It is all against Dr. Gaster and throws considerable doubt upon his statement that most scholars attribute these coins either to Simon the Maccabee or Simon Bar Kochba.

In the *Revue Biblique* for April, 1914, M. J. Germer-Durand des Augustins de l'Assomption published a description of a Jewish kitchen which had recently been unearthed in Jerusalem on the site commonly called the Grotto of the Tears of St. Peter. During the excavation a small hoard of coins was found, consisting of Roman monies contemporary with the First Revolt of the Jews. It happily included a shekel and half shekel of the types under discussion.

M. Germer-Durand says: "Les numismates discutent sur l'âge de ces pièces, qu'ils voudraient faire remonter à l'époque des Macchabées. Je les crois seulement de temps du siège" (he had previously designated this "de la première révolte des Juifs), "et j'ai de bonnes raisons pour cela; mais ce n'est pas le moment de les exposer."

That psychological moment has not yet come, but two inferences may be drawn from this important find.

Either the hoarder included the shekel and half shekel in his treasure as a kind of mascot or lucky pieces, or they were just the Jewish current pieces of the time at which the hoard was willingly or unwillingly deposited. Personally I am inclined to the former view; but in any case it proves indisputably that these shekels and half shekels in

question cannot be attributed to Simon Bar Kochba, for the very excellent reason that they must have been deposited before A.D. 70 and the destruction of Jerusalem.

There would seem no further need to labour the point. I trust I have brought forward enough evidence to shew that Dr. Gaster's conclusions cannot stand.

With his brilliant exposition of the Messianic tradition and legends attaching to Aaron's rod and the pot of manna I have no quarrel. Indeed, I am no judge at all of them. But as far as the correct attribution of the famous shekels and half shekels goes, scholars and numismatists, despite Dr. Gaster's re-examination of the whole problem in the light of the traditions which he has brought to our attention, will still be torn between the claims of Simon the Maccabee and the First Revolt, as their wit and judgment shall decide, and will leave Simon Bar Kochba severely alone, until further evidence is forthcoming to bring to a satisfactory end a dispute which has been a joy and a puzzle for at least two hundred years.

EDGAR ROGERS.

"THE NEW 'CONSTRAINT OF CHRIST.'"

THIS Agony of the world has surely thrown open a new and effectual door for Christ—one of the everlasting doors. The collapse of our secular civilisation, the starting out into the light again of passions and aptitudes about which we had all come to think that they had been driven for ever from the breast of man; all that, that is to say, everything to-day, is a commentary and reinforcement of a line from the ancient wisdom of the race, "Except the Lord do build the house, they labour in vain that build it." Unless we are to despair of humanity altogether, we must

believe that all this need not have been, and would not have been, had not certain deeper instincts and capacities in the human soul been neglected or corrupted or denied. We see now quite clearly, against the darkness of the present background, that knowledge, culture, wealth, bring of themselves no security for the orderly and co-operating future of mankind: and we have to confess that even after the blood has ceased to flow in this present European tragedy, there is no security in the mere pomp and circumstance of nations, in the secondary abilities and achievements of the mind of man, that one day, later on, when the memory of the present horror has abated and been forgotten, the wildness in man's blood shall not assert itself anew in some world-wide conflagration, in which, it may be, Armageddon shall be realised, and this world of ours, which God meant to be so fair, return to the desolateness of mere nature.

For when we sit down in front of events to-day and interpret them, as God means we should, by the help of what we know about ourselves as moral beings, we see, so clearly that once we have grasped it nothing else seems worth saying, that there can be no final peace in the world of mankind until all races and kingdoms and peoples are unanimous as to the nature of God. Not until we are at one as to what ought to be the final intention of life, shall we be delivered from recurring alarms, and—for this is what it amounts to—the fear of death at the hands of our fellow-men.

There is a saying which has currency in these days, that the present breakdown of civilisation marks the failure of the Church.

Now I am not concerned to repel that charge. It is always a sign of a bad conscience when a man is eager to defend himself, or an institution to justify itself. I will

only say that it is a charge which is often brought against us by those who have no right to make such a charge, I mean those who are outside the Church in the sense that they are indifferent or contemptuous or hostile to all that the Church of Christ stands for. Men who never wished the Church well, who never moved a finger in order to implement its great ideas, are acting basely when they charge the Church of Christ with failure. It is as though a man were to charge a doctor with the death of his child because the child had not taken some medicine which the doctor had prescribed. And why had the child not taken the medicine? Because this man who is now complaining had persuaded the child that the doctor knew nothing, and that the medicine was poison!

There are, however, charges against the Church which the world as such has no right to make, charges which nevertheless *the Church* has the right and the duty to make against herself; and it would mean that the Church of Christ had lost her sensitiveness, her liability to misgivings which have the power to shake her to the very centre of her life, it would be a symptom of complacency, and degeneracy, and the oncoming of death, if in a time like this we did not take ourselves to task, and see whether and in what way, without intending it, we may have contributed to the present confusion.

Sympathetic people, even if they are outsiders, will not, I venture to think, charge any one of the Churches in our day, or during the last generation, with indolence or with a want of proper anxiety concerning the trend of things. There is only one proof which I shall adduce that at least the ministry of the Christian Church to-day is a severe and demanding vocation. It is this: attend any of the great gatherings of the Church in our day, and with rare exceptions you will find that there are no old men in the active

ministry. At a recent meeting of a Presbytery in my own Church, three deaths were announced of ministers as having occurred during the month, and the average age was just over forty. In each case, behind the secondary causes, the good man had simply fallen down in harness, the road being too steep or the burden too heavy.

No: I do not think fair-minded men will say that we have failed, if we have failed, through love of ease. We may have failed a little through the fear of man; but even there it has not been through any self-conscious and deliberate cowardice, but rather because we had *all* of us too readily fallen into a complacent and consenting attitude towards human nature.

And this leads me to the one point I wish to make, for it seems to me to suggest what must be our point of departure, our overwhelming motive, in the next advance of the Church of Christ for the conquest of the world with His mind.

For the greater part of the last fifty years the main preoccupation and anxiety of the Church has been to defend the category of belief against what seemed the disintegrating innuendoes of science. There was a most reasonable anxiety in the minds of our fathers, that if certain theories were permitted to pass unchallenged, the spiritual basis of life would be denied and all things would be reduced to terms of chemistry and mechanics.

Now, we are not claiming that it was the Church alone and the Church directly which accomplished what has been accomplished in that great controversy, namely that materialism as a complete basis for all the wealth of life and for man's ineradicable instincts has been discredited; but what we may fairly claim for the Church is that in that warfare of ultimate and mutually exclusive ideas, the Church played the glorious part of Belgium in the

present war. She held back the enemy, impeding and embarrassing him, until a still deeper science and philosophy had acquainted itself with the still deeper secrets of human personality, and until the whole world had become aware of the nature of the issue at stake.

Now we are so made that we can only think passionately of one thing at a time; and the defence of our *right to believe* was, for an entire generation, our one exhausting anxiety.

This conflict too in the region of ultimate ideas was one that came home to the very bosom of common people—so that it was not possible for any sympathetic man to carry on his ministry without wishing to help his own people and to fortify them against the subtle and withering suggestions of the secular knowledge of the time.

The evolutionary hypothesis had pushed us all out of our depth into an ocean of overwhelming vastness. It pleased God indeed to send us at the time one or two superlative men of vision, men like Tennyson and Browning and Watts, who, by their genius and insight and spiritual heroism, supplied the more tender and far-seeing minds of an entire generation—I will not say with a new language of faith but—with a new method of attack and of defence.

Still, the new knowledge, which dates from the middle of the nineteenth century, with its theories of descent and ascent, its demand for a background of infinite space and interminable time on which the drama of human existence can alone have been played, left the soul of man in a new loneliness, the blue sky over his head no longer the friendly floor of heaven, but only the inexorable countenance of vacant and unfathomable space.

I must not pursue this line further. I have said enough to suggest to sympathetic outsiders how it became the urgent task and responsibility, especially of ministering

servants of Christ in the Church, to declare the dear and indestructible Love of God in Christ; to say to our generation, which had become confused by the gnosticism of the nineteenth century, precisely what St. Paul said so triumphantly to those who were threatened by the gnosticism of the first century—that nothing can separate us from the Love of God which is in Christ Jesus our Lord; that, however undeniable was the ambiguity of things, equally undeniable was it—and this is the truth which man must cling to or lose his sanity—that those lights and shadows which cross the human soul and of which we one by one at the depths are aware, those lights and shadows which correspond somehow to the moral features of our life, to our private loyalties and disloyalties, belong likewise to a world of realities, to a world in close contact with ourselves whose builder and maker is God.

In a word, our one preoccupation for the greater part of the last fifty years compelled us to become *subjective*. We were concerned to prove that our Christian faith was *impregnable*.

It is not for us to say whether we did well to be anxious, or whether we chose the best way to repel the insinuations of that larger knowledge, and to gain the victory over our own timidity. In any case, in the battle of those ultimate ideals faith has conquered. The right to believe has been established.

There is no doubt, however, that we were all inclined to hang too long about that region, and were in danger of forgetting that such a victory is, in itself, nothing, unless we make it the point of departure for the *activities* of faith. To keep saying to ourselves and to one another, "God's in His heaven, all's right with the world," is to paralyse our souls with an abstract confidence. We have no right to say "God's in His heaven" unless we mean, "therefore

let us seek to become channels and instruments of His inexhaustible power."

Well, whilst it is only fair to say that already before the war broke out we were beginning to see that faith is nothing if it is not an active passion, the war, with its awful disclosures of what things still lie in the depth and abyss of the human heart; the war which has already produced alienations so deep and bitter that apart from God one sees no prospect of sweetening and undoing them; the war which seems to support the dismal view of human nature and human destiny—that beneath the surface we have learned nothing; the war has aroused us in a moment to the true meaning of a faith in Christ, to the meaning indeed which the Christian faith has always had in those ages when it has been a passion.

To listen to one speaking to-day of *the right to believe* is like listening to one speaking in his sleep: it is not the language of living men. We must speak to-day of *the duty to believe*, nay, *the necessity to believe;* and that which is a personal, a human, and a social necessity, is something which for man must be embraced as the truth of God.

To-day we stand nearer than men of our time have ever stood to that background of moral realities which has always been behind the Church in its great days of missionary passion. We are aware to-day as we had never been of the absolute necessity that men through all the world shall become united in God and in their thoughts about God. We see too—to allude again to a matter that has escaped in a phrase more than once already—how simply true it is that knowledge fails, that unless something happens in the depths of a man's soul which brings him under the control of a personal and Holy God, everything sinister is possible to him; and his mind is such that he can soon give specious reasons to himself for any personal

action or national policy, making his reason his accomplice and not his guide. Yes, we are prepared now to accept, not as a difficult theological proposition for which things could be said on one side and on the other, but as a simple statement of the fact of the matter that "there is no other name given under heaven whereby men must be saved except the name of Christ." These were words which, of course, we had never repudiated; but we see to-day that they were words to which we were giving only a mild and superficial application. We see now what they must have meant to him who wrote them and to those to whom he wrote. For when the New Testament speaks of a man being saved, without exception the New Testament always means *being saved from himself*, being saved from some obstinate treachery or dark liability of his own human nature. *Being saved* in the New Testament means being brought into subjection to One who knows us better than we know ourselves—One who alone has the power to rein in the wild beast in man and to let loose within man the child of God.

It is a very constant principle in my own thinking that all great emotions, all great passions, enthusiasms, idealisms, protests, faiths, are rooted in their own opposites, and burst from the human heart with a kind of inevitableness. *That inevitableness and irresistibleness arise like a kind of shudder at what will happen if the finer mood be not yielded to at once.* If we recall and ponder any time in our own life when we have listened to some high call in a kind of ecstasy, we shall agree that it happened when suddenly we perceived that we had been held fast by some unworthy spirit; and now, in a kind of terror of its continuing, we break loose. "I love the Lord," said the writer of a great psalm, "because He hath heard my voice and my supplications. The sorrows of death compassed me, and the pains of hell gat

hold upon me. I found trouble and sorrow. Then called I upon the name of the Lord, O Lord, I beseech Thee, deliver my soul. Gracious is the Lord and very merciful. I was brought low and He helped me. Return unto thy rest, O my soul, for the Lord hath dealt bountifully with thee. For Thou hast delivered my soul from death, mine eyes from tears and my feet from falling." The man, that is to say, is as conscious of the old darkness or treachery as he is of the Hand that stayed him.

And what if this be the new motive, with the very quality of explosiveness about it which marks its authenticity and its source in God, what if this be the new motive for a fresh and hopeful invasion of the whole world with the ideas and the appeals and the personalities of the Gospel of our Lord, which God has given to His Church and to us one by one, by the very poignancy of the world-confusion, and by the terror of the present prospect? For we see now that "no religion is a true religion which is not able to make men tingle, even to their physical nerve-tips, with a sense of an infinite hazard and of a wrath to come."

There is a wonderful chapter in the book of Nehemiah, the third, which describes the rebuilding of the walls of the City of God. It is a kind of "roll of honour" of the men and women who in a day of great emergency rose and saved the situation. Their names are given and that is all we know of them. But it is all we want to know. It is all that is worth knowing about any human being—how he cast his vote and struck his blow to make the Will of God more obvious in this hesitating world. And the thing that I remind myself of in this old story—a story written doubtless hundreds of years after the events, when in the long perspective of history, devout men could see all that had been accomplished—is the joy, the unanimity, the great

happiness of those who engaged in that hazardous work. But, I ask myself, what lay at the back of such heartiness and passion and unanimity? The walls had lain in ruins for some seventy years. Many a time doubtless it had been proposed that something should be done. But it was only upon a certain day that inaction became no longer tolerable to those people, and they rose in a body, saying no more "the walls must be built" or "should be built" or "had better be built," but "the walls shall be built," or rather saying nothing at all, but proceeding each man and woman to the task of building them. And again I ask what lay at the back of that silent passion? As I reconstruct the story, this is what it means to me. Through the breaches in the walls, wild beasts—the jackal, the hyena—in the dusk of evening would creep in and snatch here and there a little child. Suddenly the quiet air would be rent with a cry, and then a silence, and every mother's heart stood still with a terror lest it was her child. Until this condition of fear and threatening became unbearable, and those men and women rose and said, "By God's help it shall cease."

Well, the sun of faith, if it had not set, at least had hidden itself behind great clouds. There were no poignant, vivid signs of the awful need of God amongst us. We knew that there were great tracts of the human heart uncontrolled by Christ, great regions of human activity unrebuked, unredeemed by His Spirit. We had our alarms, our misgivings; but they were not enough to screw us to the point of passionate action. But now we see everything, we understand ourselves, and we are afraid. We are helpless too. But there is no reason why this helplessness should not be a new devoutness towards Christ, a new anger at our own human pride, a new humility, a new submissiveness in His hands. There is no reason why this fear concerning

the state of the world in our day and concerning the prospect of the days that are coming to our children—there is no reason why this fear should not be the travail within our spirits of a new energy deeper than reason, instinctive, elementary, having its source in the inmost] nature of things, in the outgoing, inexhaustible love of God in Christ—on which as on a tide we may launch out again.

JOHN A. HUTTON.

THE INFLUENCE OF THE BAPTIST ON THE MIND OF JESUS.

THE story of Christ's temptation has been understood by many people as a literal narrative of events. To others it has seemed plain that this description of the mental and spiritual experience through which He passed before commencing His public work is cast in a parabolic mould. Such a view is directly in harmony with what we know of Jesus' method of teaching, and therefore gains support from the fact, which has so often been pointed out, that the account must originally have come to His friends through His own lips. He would not have revealed so intimate an experience, even to them, merely to supply additional facts for His biography, or to answer curious questions about His retirement in the wilderness. His object must have been definitely educational; and if so, then it would be natural for Him to use language which, while it satisfied the superficially-minded with an intelligible meaning, yielded up its deepest teaching only to those who were willing to ponder over His words. In this paper the allegorical interpretation will be assumed; and its purpose is to argue that the direction which the Lord's meditation took during these momentous

days was suggested by the person and work of the man from whom He had but lately parted, John the Baptist.

In the months immediately before He stepped forward into the public eye, the mission of the Baptist must have occupied the mind of Jesus to a degree which can hardly be overestimated. The wide-spread interest which that event aroused among all classes was enhanced in His case by the link of relationship. And when at last He felt that the time had come to pass out from the quiet home-life that He had known for thirty years, His first act was to visit His cousin on the banks of the Jordan, and share in the baptism by which so many of His countrymen were proclaiming their recognition of the seriousness of the moral crisis created by John's preaching. It is generally supposed that it was at this time that the consciousness of a special vocation was borne in upon His soul, and the title of "Beloved Son" described it in His mind. We do not need to ask how much those words meant to Him at the moment; it is enough that when, in the story of the following forty days, we find the significant words "If thou art the Son of God" twice repeated, we are justified in concluding that it was with the nature of that vocation, and with the best way of accomplishing it, that his thoughts just then were busy.

How could His work best be done? How could He ensure success? In what did success consist? In seeking to answer such questions as these, He had one most important fact to work from,—the influence which the Baptist had gained over the men of his nation. *He* had succeeded, at any rate. And there arose to mental view the picture of an ascetic figure, clad in camel's hair and leathern girdle, eating locusts and wild honey. He heard again stern words spoken: "Ye offspring of vipers, who warned you to flee from the wrath to come?" He noted the absence of any compromise with popular ideals, or of concession to the

standards of those who were addressed: certainly, the teaching to publicans and soldiers could hardly have been palatable to their taste. He thought of the severe restriction of method: John would persuade men to repentance, if he could; but he would not compel; he "did no miracle" to force men's faith and obedience. Here, plainly, were some of the principles operative in true work. In this way, and in this way alone, could success be won of such sort as was worth the winning.

And so Jesus emerged from His retirement with His mind resolved on several questions. He would not let the thought of personal comfort enter into the performance of His task, or use His Messiahship—whatever that might ultimately be found to mean—as an instrument for promoting it. He would not seek to win acceptance for His message by adopting the ideals of His contemporaries in so far as these were seen to be materialistic or otherwise imperfect, nor build His kingdom on the foundation of popular prejudices. He would base His appeal for men's allegiance on the intrinsic truthfulness and power of His gospel, and would not employ the motives of ignorant fear or superstitious wonder to drive men to professions which were not inspired by the love of goodness and of God. The three-fold decision is enshrined for us in the account of the three-fold temptation.

We may notice incidentally that although the victory was won and the choice made once and for all, yet it is plain that in after-days the strength of His resolution was sometimes tested through the ordinary intercourse of friendship. It was one of His closest friends who protested later against His acquiescence in a prospect which differed so fundamentally from the world's view of great achievement. And the reproof which the protest drew from Jesus reminds us, by the

actual words used, of the similar temptation months before to compromise with worldly standards.

The view which has been put forward in this paper,—that the mission of the Baptist provided the framework for the Lord's meditations in the wilderness,—would seem to be a probable one in itself. But there is an interesting confirmation in the subsequent narrative. John, we read, sent a message to Jesus from prison, and "when the messengers . . . were departed, he began to say unto the multitudes concerning John, What went ye out into the wilderness to behold?" His object was to re-establish the Baptist's greatness in the minds of the bystanders by recalling to them what they had known of him and his work, and the way in which he had gained his influence over their lives. And the three questions by which Jesus effected this run on the lines which the Temptation-story has made familiar to us. Was it conceivable that such an influence could ever have been wielded by one who lived a life of luxury? Or by one who had no opinions of his own, but wavered in his message, changing his teaching according to his company and adopting without protest the standards and conventions of his hearers? Was it not as a prophet, and no thaumaturge, that they had thought of him, speaking forth the words of God and appealing to them only by the power which the truth always exerts on human hearts? In such wise do the old ideas recur. The fact that our Lord's inquiry on this occasion into the conditions of John's success follows, albeit in a different order, the same outline as his earlier meditations about His own work is surely significant of a connexion between the two.

To some people it may seem that the parallelism has been overstrained, inasmuch as there is nothing to show that the "reed shaken with the wind" was intended to be understood metaphorically. It may indeed be admitted that

those commentators are right who argue that the necessarily literal meaning of the "man clothed in soft raiment" is, so far as it bears on the question, in favour of the literal meaning of the preceding words also, and that such a meaning makes good sense. But it appears reasonable to think that both interpretations were present in the mind of Jesus, and that we have here one more example of His favourite method of teaching; there was more in the words than met the ear. And if the quick spontaneity of the question is felt to constitute an objection to this, we may reply that, according to the view which has been taken in this paper, thoughts about John and his successful work had long dwelt in our Lord's mind; and it may well be that from the time of His temptation the waving reed had been the symbol to Him of an inconstant teacher, prophesying smooth things to please his audience.

C. F. Russell.

THE PARABLE OF THE UNJUST STEWARD.

St. Luke xvi. 1–14.

If it were not for the moral questions raised by xvi. 8 it is unlikely that it would ever have been disputed that this parable was intended to teach Christians the right use of money.

"Mammon" means "money," and "the unrighteous mammon" has a parallel in St. Paul, 1 Tim. vi. 10, "The love of money, which is the root of all kinds of evil."

That the evangelist and those who heard the parable spoken so understood it, is certain from the comment added in verse 14, "And the Pharisees also, who were lovers of money, heard all these things, and they scoffed at him."

There is much evidence in the New Testament that avarice

was then, as it ever has been since, a besetting sin of the Jews.

The same saying which is recorded in verse 13, "No man can serve two masters .... ye cannot serve God and mammon," appears also in the Sermon on the Mount, Matt. vi. 24. In St. Luke xviii. 25 our Lord says, "How hardly shall they who have riches enter into the kingdom of God. All three Synoptists[1] record the denunciation of the scribes and Pharisees "which devour widows' houses."

In both St. Mark vii. 22 and St. Luke xii. 15 appears Christ's warning against covetousness, a warning ten times repeated in St. Paul's Epistles [2] also in Hebrews xiii. 5 and 2 Peter ii. 3, 14, besides five [3] passages in which St. Paul mentions as a special qualification of Church officials that they should not be given to filthy lucre.

Against this very strong case for interpreting the parable in its natural sense two main arguments have been adduced. Firstly, it has been urged, e.g., by Latham in *Pastor Pastorum*, p. 389, that as this parable was addressed to the disciples, who had no worldly goods at all, its main lesson cannot be to inculcate Christian prudence in their use. To this it may be replied, (1) that parables were expressly used by our Lord as His vehicle for teaching "others" as distinguished from the inner circle of the Twelve (see Luke viii. 10 ; cf. Matt. xiii. 34 ; Mark iv. 34), and in this particular case the context clearly shows this parable to have been a part of His public teaching, as we are specifically told that the Pharisees heard it, verse 14 ; (2) that certainly not all of the disciples were destitute of worldly goods, for Joseph of Arimathea is called "a rich

[1] Matt. xxiii. 14 ; Mark xii. 40 ; Luke xx. 47.

[2] Rom. i. 29 ; 1 Cor. v. 10, 11 ; ib. vi. 10 ; 2 Cor. ix. 5 ; Eph. v. 3, 5 ; Col. iii. 5 ; 1 Thess. ii. 5 ; 2 Tim. iii. 2.

[3] 1 Tim. iii. 3, 8 ; ib. vi. 10 ; Tit. i. 7, 11 ; see also 1 Pet. v. 2.

man, " Mary the mother of John Mark had a spacious house and was quite probably owner of the Gethsemane estate, the women which came with Him from Galilee had apparently no difficulty in obtaining the costly spices and ointments for embalming. St. Mark, moreover, twice in one verse, ii. 15, emphasises the fact that "many publicans,"[1] to whom the lesson upon " mammon " would specially apply, " followed him " ; (3) that only as an exception is the application of Christ's teaching to be limited to the special circumstances of His more intimate disciples, and, as has been shown above, this is certainly not the case here ; so the natural inference is that the lesson of the parable applies to all Christians in every age.

Dismissing therefore this argument as of little weight, we turn to the second, that our Lord could not have cited such an immoral act as that described in verses 5–7 as an example to be followed, which he implicitly does in verse 9, even if ὁ κύριος in verse 8 be exclusively confined to the landlord, which does not seem quite natural.

At first sight this contention appears to have much cogency, but I am informed by a learned Hebraist (Canon G. H. Box) that it was customary for landlords in Palestine to agree with their steward for a fixed sum as rental for the whole estate, the steward then making what profit he could by sub-letting to various tenants in the landlord's name.[2] Every one of course knows that a similar system was adopted by the Roman Government in their collection of taxes through " publicans."

This explanation completely removes the difficulty, it moreover accounts for the difference in the amount of

[1] Alford (see note on Luke xvi. 1) thinks that the parable was perhaps specially addressed to the publicans.

[2] See also *Expository Times*, vol. xiv. p. 334 (1903), article by Margaret D. Gibson, and several articles in vol. xv.

remission to the two tenants, and makes much more natural the commendation of his lord in verse 8. The steward had been rack-renting, but in some cases the bargain struck had been harder than others. The remission was probably in itself an act of justice, dictated no doubt by the selfish motive of providing for his own future, but still quite within the steward's rights, as the profit thereby lost would have gone into his own pocket.

The lesson intended to be taught to Christians is plain. They should regard their money as a part of the trust committed to them by God, as a means of doing good and helping others, remembering that it is their faithful execution of this trust which will gain the divine commendation, "Well done, thou good and faithful servant, enter thou into the joy of thy Lord."

A Sloman.

THE ITALIAN ORIGIN OF THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

Some difficulty is presented by the phrase "*οἱ ἀπὸ*," in Hebrews xiii. 24., "*ἀσπάζονται ὑμᾶς οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰταλίας*." It has been held by some that the meaning is "those from Italy," i.e., certain Italians who were present with the writer and in exile from their native land. Others have regarded the sentence as evidence of the Roman origin of the Epistle, translating it, "those residing in Italy salute you." The preposition is used so often in the Papyri before the names of villages and towns that light might be expected to fall from them upon this disputed point.

The main use of the phrase, "*οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς πόλεως* or *τῆς κώμης*," in the Papyri appears to be in the meaning of the inhabitants of this town or village. Ox. Pap. 299, e.g.,

contains a declaration on oath of Epimachus to the scribe of the Oxyrynchite Nome, stating that he has exacted no irregular contributions, and Epimachus styles himself *τῶν ἀπὸ κώμης Ψώβθεως* (i.e., obviously, one of those living at the village of Psobthis). This use of the word may be influenced by consideration of the journey which his letter would have to take from Psobthis to its destination. This explanation cannot be given of the use of *ἀπὸ*, as it occurs in Ox. Pap. 266, A Deed of Divorce. This deed was drawn up at the city of Oxyrynchus and was discovered there, yet the parties concerned therein are styled "*πάντες ἀπ' Ὀξυρύγχων πόλεως*." Nor was this unusual. It is rather the invariable custom of the Papyri. Cf. Ox. Pap. 284, a letter from one Alexander described as "*τῶν ἀπ' Ὀξυρύγχων πόλεως γερδίων*, "One of the Ox. weavers," and Fay. Pap. 84, "*τῶν ἀπὸ Θεαδελφείας γεωργῶν*," "One of the Theadelphian farmers." These uses appear to us to show that "*ἀπὸ*" was practically equivalent to "*ἐν*."

These examples occur in tax-receipts, etc., and what interest could the mention of a writer's native or ancestral city have for the tax-collector or governor, since what he required to know was the present place of residence?

There is one passage which might at first sight seem to favour another view. Fay. Pap. 86 is an account of payments in barley, wheat and lentils from various classes of persons in several villages. One entry is:—*Πολυδευκείας δημοσίων, διὰ τῶν ἀπὸ τῆς κώμης—πυροῦ ἀρταβαι* $\overline{\alpha\gamma\iota\beta}$ . . . *καὶ διὰ τῶν ἀπὸ Θεαδελφείας πυρον κ.τ.λ.* "For the Crown lands at Polydeucia—(paid) by those (farmers) of the village . . . of wheat so much, etc. . . . (paid) by those of Theadelphia—of wheat so much, etc." Thus, people farming lands at Polydeucia appear in a connexion with Theadelphia which is indicated by *ἀπὸ*. When we note, however, that the villages are at a very short distance apart (see Fay. Pap. 118–

11), the readiest conclusion is that Theadelphia was their place of residence. It can hardly be argued that the most probable meaning of the passage is that crown-lands at Polydeucia were rented (1) by natives of Polydeucia, (2) by natives of Theadelphia. Not their place of origin but their place of residence was of interest to the rent-collector.

The census returns, and returns in connexion with the poll-tax, contain the same phrase (Ox. Pap. 171, 157, 158, etc.). In such documents, surely, again the object of greatest importance was to find out where the people then dwelt, not their ancestral homes. There is no evidence in the Papyri that the Palestinian mode of registration (cf. Luke ii. 4) was widespread throughout the Empire. On the other hand, it is obvious that great care was taken to find out the present residence of the people, since immediate notice of removal was required (see Ox. Pap. 251, 252, 253, etc.).

Our conclusion does not necessarily imply that ἀπὸ had lost all its original force. The latent sense of motion-from can be detected in these uses since the people had to come *from* such and such a city to pay their taxes, and from the point of view of headquarters all their communications, deeds, agreements, etc., were *from* their place of dwelling. Similarly, the New Testament sentence is explicable by the fact that their salutation had to come from Italy—the whence of the salutation marking the where of those who salute. This kind of expression is represented by the very oldest Greek. Clyde, *Greek Syntax*, page 162, quotes the following from Herodotus: "οἱ ἀπὸ τῶν καταστρωμάτων τοῖς ἀκοντίοις ἐχρῶντο." "Those who were on the decks used javelins." Ἀπὸ, Clyde says, denotes the where of the men by denoting the whence of the javelins.

Our conclusion is that no inhabitant of the Mediterranean world of the first three centuries of our era, finding the

Epistle to the Hebrews, and knowing no reason for taking its phrases in any special sense, would come to any other conclusion, after reading chapter xiii. 24, than that the Epistle conveyed greetings from certain Christians resident in Italy. Accordingly, it is natural to find Theodoret and Primasius among the upholders of its Italian origin.

W. D. Gardiner.

THE HUMAN AND THE SUPERHUMAN MESSIAHS.

It would conduce to clearness in our conceptions of the Messianic claims of Jesus if it were borne in mind that there were at least two conceptions of Messiah's nature amongst the Jewish people. According to the one he was a highly gifted human being for whom no pre-existence in the heavenly regions was claimed; according to the other he was a superhuman being living in heaven, to be revealed at the appointed time when in the purposes of God the world's history was to reach its final crisis. It is true, however, that the work which was expected from the Messiah in both cases was very nearly the same—the judgment and overthrow of all evil powers, human and angelic, the establishment of the Messianic Kingdom or the introduction to the abodes of bliss and woe of the righteous and wicked. But it must be noted that it is chiefly in such books as teach the coming of the New Heaven and the New Earth, e.g., 4 Esdras, and in connexion with what we call the other world, that the supernatural activity of the superhuman Messiah becomes most prominent.

The doctrine of the superhuman Messiah is at least as old as the first half of the first century B.C., being found in the Similitudes of the Book of Enoch, which Dr. Charles assigns to that period; and in Pauline Christianity it assumed an importance which it has never since lost. The

doctrine of the human Messiah is familiar to us from the Old Testament, in the writings of which he becomes more and more an ideal figure, with the qualities of a supremely capable and righteous king; and we find numerous traces of it also in the New Testament.

In this article an attempt is made to trace these two conceptions through the canonical and uncanonical Scriptures, conceptions which remained more or less separate from each other till the time of St. Paul.

I. The Human Messiah.

The human Messiah is generally regarded as being of Davidic descent, or as being descended from Judah or Levi, or from Judah *and* Levi. But Cyrus also appears to have been regarded as Messiah (Isa. xliv. 28; xlv. 1); so too the re-appearing Elijah (Sir. xlviii. 10 f.). In the Zadokite Fragment, which probably belongs to the first years of the first century A.D., the Messiah is expected from Aaron and Israel.

(*i.*) *The Messiah's Descent.*

(*a*) *From David.*

Several times in the canonical and uncanonical Scriptures God is represented as promising to David that his house or throne or kingdom shall be established for ever (2 Sam. vii. 12 ff.; Ps. lxxxix. 3 f.; Isa. ix. 7; Sir. xlv. 25; xlvii. 11; cf. Isa. xvi. 5). "Thou, O Lord, didst choose David (to be) king over Israel, and swaredest to him touching his seed that never should his kingdom fail before Thee" (Ps. Sol. xvii. 5). But often it is not merely a continuation of the Davidic dynasty that is hoped for. We meet with the expectation of an ideal king of the house of David. The prophets speak of "a rod out of the stem of Jesse" (Isa. xi. 1; cf. Sir. xlv. 25), "a branch out of the roots of Jesse" (Isa. xi. 1; cf. *v.* 10), "a righteous branch (or sprout) to

David" (Jer. xxiii. 5; xxxiii. 15). Micah says, "Out of thee (Bethlehem Ephratah) shall he come forth unto me that is to be ruler in Israel" (v. 2; cf. John vii. 42).

This expectation of an ideal ruler of the house of David frequently appears in the New Testament, where emphasis is repeatedly laid on the Davidic descent of Jesus. Jesus is said to have been of the seed of David (Rom. i. 3; 2 Tim. ii. 8), and is called "the root of David" (Rev. v. 5), "the root and the offspring of David" (xxii. 16). The genealogies (Matt. i.; Luke iii.) are intended to show His line of descent from the hero-king.

St. Paul, who was an ardent champion of the doctrine of the superhuman Messiah, was equally a champion of the doctrine of the Incarnation, and stoutly declares, "Jesus Christ our Lord . . . was made of the seed of David according to the flesh" (Rom. i. 3). But that there were felt to be difficulties in the way of believing that a heavenly being, pre-existent from all eternity, could at the same time be a true descendant of David, appears from the fact that Jesus is represented as saying of the Messiah, "David himself calleth him Lord; and whence is he then his son?" (Mark xii. 35–37 and parallels).

(*b*) *From Judah.*

In the *Testaments of the XII. Patriarchs* the Messiah is frequently regarded as being descended from Judah, though not so frequently as from Levi. Other books also show traces of the Messiah's Judahite descent.

It is said that to Judah God Himself gave the sovereignty (T. R. vi. 7; T. Iss. v. 7). "The angel of the Lord said unto me," Judah is represented as saying, "thou shalt be king of Jacob" (T. J. xxi. 5); "My father blessed me, saying, Thou shalt be a king, prospering in all things" (i. 6).

Like David, Judah was to have a distinguished represen-

tative in one of his descendants. "A king shall arise in Judah and shall establish a new priesthood" (T. L. viii. 14). "The Lord shall raise up . . . from Judah as it were a king" (T. S. vii. 2). Isaac is represented as saying, "A prince shalt thou [Judah] be, thou and one of thy sons, over the sons of Jacob" (Jub. xxxi. 18).

It is from Judah that the salvation of the Lord shall come. "In thee shall be the help of Jacob, and in thee be found the salvation of Israel" (Jub. xxxi. 19; cf. T. S. vii. 2; T. N. viii. 2). From Judah's seed "a man shall arise, like the sun of righteousness" (T. J. xxiv. 1).

(c) *From Levi.*

In the days of the Maccabean priest-kings there was a strong feeling in favour of the Levitic descent of the Messiah. The heroic struggle of the Maccabees had raised the enthusiasm of a large section of the people to such a pitch that they were ready to regard certain members of that priestly family as Messianic personages, but naturally when the dynasty degenerated this opinion changed.

In Sirach an exalted view is taken of the priestly office, and it is further said that all the kings of Judah, with the exception of David, Hezekiah and Josiah, failed, having committed trespass in forsaking the Law of the Most High (xlix. 4). More space is given to the glorification of Aaron and his sons (xlv. 6–24) than to the deeds and virtues of the Patriarchs (xliv. 16–23) and even of Moses (xlv. 1–5); and it is asserted that there is an eternal priesthood in Aaron's line (xlv. 7, 13, 15, 24; l. 24; cf. Jub. xxxi. 13 f.). Simeon (II.), the high-priest, son of Onias, is glorified (Sir. l. 1–24).

With regard to the Maccabees in particular it seems probable that Psalm cx. was written in praise of Simon the Maccabee, the brother of Jonathan (1 Macc. xiv. 4 ff., esp. 18), who was made high-priest for ever (xiv. 17, 35, 41),

and whose reign is described as having been accompanied by Messianic blessings (xiv. 4–15, 35 f.; cf. Sib. Or. iii. 652); and to Judas the Maccabee (1 En. xc. 37 f.), and to John Hyrcanus were accorded Messianic honours (T. R. vi. 8–11; T. L. viii. 14 f., 18; T. Jos. xix. 8; T. J. xxiv. 1 ff. [prob.] cf. Josephus, *Wars*, 1. 2. 8.; *Ant.* 16. 6. 2). The Patriarchs are also represented as predicting that the tribe of Levi should help the others (T. Jos. xix. 6 ff.; T. S. v. 5), and the seed of Levi should die in wars visible and invisible (T. R. vi. 12), predictions which were regarded as being fulfilled in the Maccabean struggle. Later the priest-kings were condemned (Ps. Sol. xvii. 6 ff.; Assumption of Moses vi. 1); but as long as they ruled wisely and righteously and Israel prospered under them, they were in great favour (cf. Jub. xxxi. 15).

Levi received the first blessing, and Judah the second (Jub. xxxi. 13–20). The former God chose to be king of the nation (T. R. vi. 11 f.), and to him He gave the sovereignty (T. R. vi. 7; T. L. viii. 14). His seed shall therefore be among the sons of Reuben as an eternal king (T. R. vi. 12), and to him they ought to hearken (vi. 8). The patriarch just named is represented as saying to his children, "Draw ye near to Levi in humbleness of heart, that ye may receive a blessing from his mouth. For he shall bless Israel and Judah, because him hath the Lord chosen to be king over all the nation. And bow down before his seed, for on our behalf it will die in wars visible and invisible, and will be among you an eternal king" (T. R. vi. 10–12).

Levi also received the priesthood (T. Iss. v. 7); and accordingly he and his sons shall be priests for ever (T. L. viii. 3, 13 f.; T. Iss. v. 7; Jub. xxxii. 1). From him a new priest shall be raised up. "The Lord shall raise up a new priest. And to him all the words of the Lord shall be revealed; and he shall execute a righteous judgment upon

the earth for a multitude of days. And his star shall arise in heaven as of a king " (T. L. xviii. 2 f.).

(*d*) *From Levi and Judah.*

An attempt seems to have been made to reconcile the two preceding beliefs by dividing the honours equally between Levi and Judah. " By thee [Levi] and Judah shall the Lord appear among men " (T. L. ii. 11). " Through their tribes shall God appear on earth, to save the race of Israel, and to gather together the righteous from amongst the Gentiles " (T. N. viii. 3). By these two tribes " shall Israel stand " (T. D. v. 4); from them " shall arise the salvation of God " (T. S. vii. 1), " shall salvation arise unto Israel " (T. N. viii. 2). " The Lord shall raise up from Levi as it were a High-priest, and from Judah as it were a King " (T. S. vii. 2).

(*e*) *From Aaron and Israel.*

The Zadokite Fragment rejects the expectation of a Messiah from Judah, and regards him as being descended from Aaron and Israel (ii. 10, viii. 2, ix. 8, 10, etc.), which Dr. Charles explains as meaning from the Maccabees through Mariamne and from Herod (*Eschatology*, 282 f.; *Apoc. and Pseud.* ii. 795). Herod and Mariamne had two sons, Alexander and Aristobulus.

(*ii.*) *The Nature of the Human Messiah.*

(*a*) *His Ethical Perfection.*

The Messiah is " a righteous branch " (Jer. xxiii. 5 f.), " a rod of righteousness " (T. J. xxiv. 6). He " shall arise like the sun of righteousness (cf. Mal. iv. 2), walking with the sons of men . . . in righteousness " (T. J. xxiv. 1). He shall be " a righteous king " (Ps. Sol. xvii. 35), " a holy prince " (Sib. Or. iii. 49). " He shall judge peoples and nations in the wisdom of his righteousness " (Ps. Sol. xvii.

31). He shall be "a man working righteousness" (T. N. iv. 5), "a blessed man" (Sib. Or. v. 414), "a blameless . . . and a sinless one" (T. B. iii. 8); "and no sin shall be found in him" (T. J. xxiv. 1), "He . . . (will be) pure from sin" (Ps. Sol. xvii. 41).

Other prominent characteristics of the Messiah are wisdom and humility. "God will make him . . . wise by means of the spirit of understanding" (Ps. Sol. xvii. 42; cf. Isa. xi. 2). "The spirit of understanding and sanctification shall rest upon him" (T. L. xviii. 7). "His words shall be more refined than costly gold, the choicest" (Ps. Sol. xvii. 48).

"A man shall arise . . . walking with the sons of men in meekness" (T. J. xxiv. 1). "The Holy One of Israel shall reign over it (Jerusalem) in humility" (T. D. v. 13). "He is true and long-suffering, meek and lowly, and teacheth by his works the law of God" (ibid. vi. 9).

We shall see later that it is to God the Messiah owes the qualities which fit him for his work. Here it may be pointed out that the inference does not appear to have been drawn that because he was ethically perfect he was therefore divine. The framers of the doctrine do not seem to have had a presentiment of the Christian argument that the perfect man must have a divine origin.

(*b*) *No Pre-existence of the Human Messiah.*

We shall see that pre-existence is frequently asserted of the superhuman Messiah. It never is of the human. The terms used in connexion with the coming of the latter give no hint that he existed before his coming into the world.

It is said that God shall raise him up. "The Lord shall *raise up* a new priest" (T. L. xviii. 2); "shall *raise up* from Levi as it were a High-priest, and from Judah as it were

a King" (T. S. vii. 2). The psalmist prays God to "*raise up* unto them their king, the son of David" (Ps. Sol. xvii. 23; cf. *v.* 47).

God shall send him. "From the sunrise God shall *send* a king, who shall give every land relief from the bane of war" (Sib. Or. iii. 652 f.). "A king *sent* from God against him (Nero ?) shall destroy all the mighty kings" (ibid. v. 108 f.).

Other terms used in connexion with his coming do not imply that he is pre-existent. "A holy prince shall *come* to wield the sceptre over all the world unto all ages of hurrying time" (Sib. Or. iii. 49 f.). "A king shall *arise* in Judah" (T. L. viii. 14). "A star shall *arise* to you from Jacob . . . and a man shall *arise*, like the sun of righteousness" (T. J. xxiv. 1). "From your root shall *arise* a stem; and from it shall *grow* a rod of righteousness" (ibid. *vv.* 5 f.). "There shall *arise* unto you . . . the salvation of the Lord" (T. D. v. 10; cf. T. Jos. xix. 11). He "shall *spring* from the seed of David" (4 Esd. xii. 32; cf. John vii. 42).

(*c*) *His Relationship to God.*

He is God's messenger and servant, the divinely appointed and divinely equipped delegate.

It is God who shall raise him up and shall send him (see above (*b*)). "Him (Levi) hath the Lord *chosen* to be king over all the nation" (T. R. vi. 11). "To Levi God *gave* the sovereignty" (ibid. *v.* 7). The Messiah is "a blessed man, with the sceptre in his hand which God has *committed* to his clasp" (Sib. Or. v. 414 f.). He is "the Lord's *anointed*" (Ps. Sol. xviii. 6, 8; cf. Ps. ii. 2; Isa. xlv. 1).

He shall carry out God's purposes, not his own. He shall do everything "in obedience to the good ordinances of the mighty God" (Sib. Or. iii. 652 ff.). The Lord is "his God" (Ps. Sol. xvii. 28–42; xviii. 8), and "his king"

(ibid. xvii. 38). "His hope (will be) in the Lord . . . (He will be) strong in the fear of God" (ibid. xvii. 44; cf. xviii. 8), "taught of God" (ibid. X. vii. 35), "mighty through (his) hope in God" (*v.* 38).

The qualities which fit the Messiah for his work are bestowed upon him by God. "God will make him mighty by means of (His) holy spirit, and wise by means of the spirit of understanding, with strength and righteousness" (Ps. Sol. xvii. 42; cf. Isa. xi. 2). "The glory of the Most High shall be uttered over him, and the spirit of understanding and sanctification shall rest upon him" (T. L. xviii. 7). "The blessings of the holy Father shall be poured down upon him" (T. J. X. xiv. 2a). "The heavens shall be open (cf. Ezek. i. 1; T. L. ii. 6, v. 1; T. J. xxiv. 2; 2 Bar. xxii. 1; Matt. iii. 16 = Mark i. 10; Luke iii. 31; John i. 51; Rev. iv. 1), and from the temple of glory shall come upon him sanctification (cf. Mark i. 10 = Matt. iii. 16; Luke iii. 22), with "the Father's voice as from Abraham to Isaac" (T. L. xviii. 6; cf. *Ant.* 13. 10. 3; Ps. cx. 1; Mark i. 11= Matt. iii. 17; Luke iii. 22).

II. The Superhuman Messiah.

The belief in the coming of a superhuman Messiah is at least as old as the second century B.C.; for in the Similitudes of Enoch we find the conception already almost fully developed. It continued alongside of the belief in a purely human Messiah; and in Christianity the two beliefs were blended together (as they were later in Rabbinic theology), Jesus being regarded as at one and the same time a descendant of David and the Son of Man incarnate, or the person who in the future was to return from heaven as the Son of Man.

The superhuman Messiah is naturally a being like the angels, his home being in heaven, in God's immediate pres-

ence. He is in fact a kind of archangel, and it is interesting to find that the work assigned to Michael, especially in connexion with the Deluge, is not unlike that of the Messiah. Michael punishes Semjâzâ and his associates, the fallen angels (1 En. x. 11 ff.). He is charged to banish all evil and every evil work from the face of the earth (1 En. x. 16–20). He is the angelic champion of Israel (Dan. x. 13, 21, xii. 1 ; 1 En. xc. 14 ; cf. xx. 7), for whom he intercedes (1 En. lxxxix. 76 ; T. L. v. 7), and whom he avenges (Ass. Mos. x. 1 f.).

(*i.*) *His Coming.*

The coming of the Messiah is mysterious. "No man knoweth whence he is" (John vi. 27 ; cf. 4 Esd. xiii. 51–53). The general expectation seems to have been that he would come from heaven, where He was pre-existent (2 Bar. xxx. 1). Jesus when born came from heaven (John iii. 3, 13), and from heaven whither He has ascended He will come again (Acts iii. 19–21 ; 1 Thess. i. 10, iv. 16 f., 2 Thess. i. 7).

There is a certain sense in which the Messiah has already been revealed to the righteous. "The wisdom of the Lord of Spirits hath *revealed* him to the holy and righteous" (1 En. xlviii. 7 ; cf. lxii. 7). They have already seen him in vision (cf. 2 Cor. xii. 1) ; but in the last time he shall be openly revealed to all (2 Bar. xxix. 3 ; 4 Esd. vii. 28, xiii. 32 ; Rev. i. 7). "That Son of Man has *appeared*, and has seated himself on the throne of his glory" (1 En. lxix. 29). Jesus said to the high priest, "*Ye shall see* the Son of Man sitting on the right hand of power" (Mark xiv. 62). "Every eye shall see Him" (Rev. i. 7).

The passive of "*manifest*" is used of the birth of Christ (1 Titus iii. 16 ; Heb. ix. 26, etc.), but it is also used of His final coming (Col. iii. 4 ; 1 Pet. v. 4 ; 1 John ii. 28). "*Apocalypse*" (1 Cor. i. 7 ; 2 Thess. i. 7 ; 1 Pet. i. 7, 13, iv. 13),

"*Epiphany*" (2 Thess. ii. 8; 1 Tim. vi. 14, etc.), "*Parousia*" (Matt. xxiv. 3, 27, 37, 39, etc.), are all used of the future revelation of Christ; and "*come*" is used with similar meaning in the Fourth Gospel (xiv. 3, 18, 23, xxi. 22).

The Messiah comes with or on the clouds of heaven. This feature is probably derived from Daniel vii. 13, "One like a son of man came with the clouds of heaven"; and is frequently met with in the New Testament as well as occasionally in the uncanonical scriptures. "Behold, he *cometh with the clouds*" (Rev. i. 7). "They shall see the Son of Man *coming in the clouds of heaven*" (Matt. xxiv. 30 =Mark xiii. 26; cf. Matt. xxvi. 64=Mark xiv. 62; Rev. xiv. 14, 16). It is worth noting, however, that sometimes this coming on the clouds is seen only by the seer in vision. This is the case with Daniel vii. 13; Rev. xiv. 14, 16; and also with the vision in 4 Esd. xiii., where the seer dreams a dream in which he sees a man who "*flew with the clouds of heaven*" (*v.* 3).

The Messiah comes escorted by translated men. There are four at least of these: Enoch (1 En. xxxix. 3 f., lxx. 1–4, etc.), Elijah (1 En. lxxxix. 52, xciii. 8, etc.); Ezra and Baruch, who are said to have been translated in the apocalyptic books named after them (4 Esd. xiv. 9, 49; 2 Bar. lxxvi. 2). "The men who have been taken up, who have not tasted death from their birth, shall appear" (4 Esd. vi. 26). "My son the Messiah shall be revealed, together with those who are with him" (ibid. vii. 28).

He is accompanied by "holy ones" (1 Thess. iii. 13; 2 Thess. i. 10; Jude 14 [quoted from 1 En. i. 9]), who, in all probability, are angels and not saints, "holy ones" being frequently used as a synonym for angels (1 En. ix. 3, xii. 2, xiv. 23; Dan. iv. 13, etc.). In some passages we are told without the slightest ambiguity that angels form his escort. "The Son of Man shall come . . . and all the

holy angels with him" (Matt. xxv. 31). "The Son of Man . . . cometh . . . with the holy angels" (Mark viii. 38 = Matt. xvi. 27; cf. Matt. xiii. 39, 41, 49; 2 Thess. i. 7).

He also comes "with glory" (cf. Luke ix. 30 f.). Glory is an attribute of the Deity (1 En. xiv. 20, xxii. 14, xxv. 3, 7, etc.; T. L. iii. 4; Tob. iii. 16, etc.), and therefore when the Messiah comes with glory he comes with all the majesty of the Godhead. It was into "glory" that Christ was received up (1 Tim. iii. 16), and in "glory" He shall come again (Mark xiii. 26=Matt. xxiv. 30; Luke xxi. 27), His own glory (Matt. xxv. 31; Mark x. 37; Titus ii. 13; 1 Pet. iv. 13; 2 Thess. i. 9), or His Father's (Mark viii. 38 = Matt. xvi. 27; cf. Ps. Sol. xi. 7). "When the Son of Man shall come in his glory . . . then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory" (Matt. xxv. 31). "The Son of Man . . . cometh in the glory of his Father" (Mark viii. 38). In this glory believers share. "When Christ, who is our life, shall appear, then shall ye also appear with Him in glory" (Col. iii. 4; cf. Rom. viii. 18).

The Messiah comes with fire, the fire of judgment. "He has destroyed every city from its foundations with sheets of fire, and burnt up the families of men who before wrought evil" (Sib. Or. v. 418 f.). "Out of his mouth there came wind, and fire, and storm; and . . . destroyed the assault of that multitude which had come to fight against him" (4 Esdras xiii. 28). "The Lord Jesus shall be revealed . . . in flaming fire taking vengeance on them that know not God" (2 Thess. i. 9; cf. ii. 8; Matt. iii. 10–12 = Luke iii. 9, 16 f.). As is sometimes the case in the theophanies of the Old Testament, it is said that the mountains melt like wax before him (1 En. lii. 6; liii. 7; cf. Ps. xcvii. 5; Mic. i. 4; 1 En. i. 6).

He descends with the sound of a trumpet. "The Lord Himself shall descend . . . with the trump of God" (1

Thess. iv. 16; cf. 1 Cor. xv. 52). The trumpet sounds the alarm, announcing the judgment of the wicked. "Blow ye the trumpet in Zion, and sound an alarm in my holy mountain . . . for the day of the Lord cometh, for it is nigh at hand" (Joel ii. 1; cf. Ps. Sol. viii. 1). "Fire shall come upon the whole world . . . with sword and trumpet" (Sib. Or. iv. 173 f.). "The trumpet shall give a sound, which when every man heareth they shall suddenly be afraid" (4 Esdras vi. 23; cf. Rev. viii. 2 ff.). By the same means the elect will be summoned together. We probably find the starting-point of this idea in Isaiah xxvii. 13. "The great trumpet shall be blown, and they shall come . . . and shall worship the Lord in the holy mount at Jerusalem." "Blow ye in Zion on the trumpet to summon (the) saints" (Ps. Sol. ii. 1). "The Son of Man . . . shall send his angels with a great sound of a trumpet, and they shall gather together his elect from the four winds, from one end of heaven to the other" (Matt. xxiv. 31).

A voice is also heard when the Messiah descends. "The Lord Himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel" (1 Thess. iv. 16). "Men shall hear a crash as of thunder, even the voice of God" (Sib. Or. v. 345). "With a mighty voice God shall speak unto all the undisciplined empty-minded people" (ibid. iii. 669 f.).

(*ii.*) *The Nature of the Superhuman Messiah.*

(*a*) *His Ethical Perfection.*

He is uniquely righteous, "the Righteous One." "*The Righteous One* shall appear before the eyes of the righteous" (1 En. xxxviii. 2; cf. liii. 6). "They have slain them which shewed before of the coming of *the Righteous One*" (Acts vii. 52; cf. iii. 14, xxii. 14; cf. Matt. xxvii. 19, etc.).

He "is the Son of Man who hath righteousness, with

whom dwelleth righteousness" (1 En. xlvi. 3); "the Son of Man who is born unto righteousness, over whom righteousness abides, and whom the righteousness of the Head of Days forsakes not" (lxxi. 14). "He is mighty in all the secrets of righteousness" (xlix. 2); "and the spirit of righteousness was poured out upon him" (lxii. 2).

The angels are "holy ones" (1 En. i. 9, ix. 3, xii. 2, etc.; Job v. 1, xv. 15, etc.), but he is "*the Holy One*" (Acts iii. 14), "the Holy One of God" (Mark i. 24; Luke iv. 34; John vi. 69), "Thy (i.e. God's) Holy Child or Servant" (Acts iv. 30; cf. 2 Bar. lxx. 9).

He further excels in wisdom and understanding. "Wisdom is poured out like water . . . before him" (1 En. xlix. 1). "His mouth shall pour forth all the secrets of wisdom and counsel" (li. 3). "In him dwells the spirit of wisdom, and the spirit which gives insight, and the spirit of understanding and of might" (xlix. 3; cf. Isa. xi. 2; Ps. Sol. xvii. 42). In Christ, says St. Paul, "are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge" (Col. ii. 3).

(*b*) *His Pre-existence.*

Unlike the human, the superhuman Messiah is regarded as having existed from all eternity, from before the creation of the world; though it is only in the last days that he shall be openly revealed to all. Emphasis must be laid on the fact that his pre-existence is real and not ideal merely. He has existed throughout all time: it has not been merely God's eternal purpose that at a certain point in the history of the world he should come into existence.

"From the beginning the Son of Man was hidden, and the Most High preserved him in the presence of His might" (1 En. lxii. 7). "He hath been chosen and hidden before Him, before the creation of the world" (xlviii. 6). "Before the sun and the signs were created, before the stars of the

heaven were made, his name was named before the Lord of Spirits" (*v.* 3). Before the world was Christ had glory with the Father (John xvii. 5; cf. Col. i. 17; 1 Pet. i. 20).

Enoch has a vision of the Son of Man, a vision, not merely of a Being who is yet to come, but of one who in his time and long before it lived in the heavenly regions. He "saw the Elect One of righteousness and of faith . . . and his dwelling-place under the wings of the Lord of Spirits" (1 En. xxxix. 6 f.). The angel who goes with Enoch tells him that the being whom he sees is the Son of Man whom "the Lord of Spirits hath chosen . . . and whose lot hath the pre-eminence before the Lord of Spirits in uprightness for ever" (xlvi. 3). "The Elect One standeth before the Lord of Spirits, and his glory is for ever and ever, and his might unto all generations" (xlix. 2).

In like manner Christ is said to have been before Abraham (John viii. 58), and David is said to have seen and acknowledged him as his Lord (Mark xii. 36; Acts. ii. 25).

This heavenly Being is being kept for the work which is reserved for him at the end of the days. "This is the Messiah whom the most High hath kept unto the end of the days" (4 Esdras xii. 32; cf. xiii. 36, xiv. 9). Amongst his companions in heaven he has Enoch and Ezra: "His (i.e. Enoch's) name during his lifetime was raised aloft to that Son of Man and to the Lord of Spirits" (1 En. lxx. 1); "Thou (Ezra) shalt be taken up from among men and henceforth thou shalt remain with My Son, and with such as are like thee, until the times be ended" (4 Esdras xiv. 9).

There is a sense in which the Messiah has already been revealed to the righteous, especially to those to whom Apocalyptic books are attributed: "The wisdom of the Lord of Spirits hath revealed him to the holy and righteous" (1 En. xlviii. 7); "The Most High . . . revealed him to the elect" (lxii. 7). But until the Advent he, along with

his companions, is invisible to those on earth: "No one upon earth can see My (i.e., God's) Son [or those that are with him], but in the time of his day" (4 Esdras xiii. 52).

It seems to be a peculiarly Christian doctrine that the *superhuman* Messiah should become incarnate. In most, if not all the Apocalyptic books the *original* teaching seems to have been that he could do his work without assuming flesh and blood. His manifestation does not involve his incarnation. On the other hand the passive of "manifest" is frequently used of the birth of Christ (1 Tim. iii. 16; Heb. ix. 26, etc.), and it is said that the Logos, the Son of Man who came down from heaven (John iii. 13, vi. 62), was made flesh (i. 14; cf. 1 Tim. iii. 16). Christ, says St. Paul, "was made of the seed of David according to the flesh" (Rom. i. 3).

(c) *His Relationship to God.*

The relationship of the superhuman as of the human Messiah to God is in the first place one of delegated authority; but we are not told how the superhuman Messiah came into existence outside of the Christian books; indeed, so far as the Apocalyptic books are concerned, we might infer that he is co-eternal with God. God's choosing or naming him is not quite the same as begetting him or creating him. It is probable, however, that the Apocalyptists took his existence for granted and did not trouble themselves as to how he originated.

The Son of Man "is the Elect One before the Lord of Spirits according to His good pleasure" (1 En. xlix. 4). His "lot hath the pre-eminence before the Lord of Spirits in uprightness for ever" (xlvi. 3). "The Lord of Spirits hath chosen him" (ibid.), hath chosen and hidden him before the creation of the world (xlviii. 6). It is "in the

name of the Lord of Spirits" that the Elect One judges (lv. 4).

From the names given to the Messiah we may also learn his relationship to God. He is "the Elect One" (1. En. xxxix. 6, xl. 5, etc.; Luke ix. 35, xxiii. 35; John i. 34), "Mine (i.e. God's) Elect One" (1 En. xlv. 3 f., li. 3, lv. 4; cf. Isa. xlii. 1), "the Elect One of God" (Luke xxiii. 35; John i. 34).

As the human Messiah is God's Anointed (Ps. Sol. xvii. 36, xviii. 6, 8), so also is the superhuman. He is "My (i.e. God's) Messiah" (2 Bar. xxxix. 7, xl. 1, lxxii. 2), "My servant Messiah" (lxx. 9), "the Messiah" (2 Bar. xxix. 3, xxx. 1; John i. 42, iv. 25), "the Christ" (Matt. i. 17, ii. 4, xi. 2, etc.), Christus (4 Esdras vii. 28 f.), Unctus (xii. 32). This name shows that the Messiah's power comes from God, but it does not imply that he shares in the nature of the Godhead.

The title "the Son of God," which in Christian times became such a common appellation of the Messiah, has been understood as meaning that he is of one substance with the Father, but it is questionable whether it meant this originally. In the Old Testament Israel is called God's son (Exod. iv. 22; Hos. xi. 1), and angels are called "the sons of God" (Gen. vi. 2, 4; Job xxxviii. 7; cf. 1 En. lxix. 4 f., lxxi. 1). The Messiah is unique in that he is "the only-begotten Son" (John i. 18, iii. 16, 18; cf. i. 14; 1 John iv. 9), "the first-begotten of all creation" (Col. i. 15); but these are also designations of God's elect people. Israel is called "firstborn" (Exod. iv. 22; Jer. xxxi. 9; Jub. ii. 20), "first-begotten" (Sir. xxxvi. 12; Ps. Sol. xviii. 4; cf. xiii. 8), "only-begotten" (Ps. Sol. xviii. 4), "primogenitus" (4 Esdras vi. 58), "unigenitus" (ibid.).

It thus appears that to the Jews and early Christians the superhuman Messiah was, next to God, the greatest Being in the universe, but that the relationship between the two

was not defined with anything like the elaborateness of later times.

There are many resemblances and some important differences in these two conceptions of the human and the superhuman Messiah. The former is not pre-existent and is born of human parents; while the latter is pre-existent and descends in a marvellous manner from the heavens, being, however, in Christian books also regarded as a descendant of David. They are both regarded as ethically perfect, and both are the delegates of God. The work they are expected to accomplish is in many respects the same, both being champions of the elect against men and devils (1 En. xlvi. 4 f.; 2 Bar. xxxix. 7, etc.; Ps. Sol. xvii. 24, 27; Rev. xvii. 14, xix. 19 f.; T. S. vi. 6); but it is the superhuman Messiah and not the human who shall raise the dead (1 En. li. 1 f.; 2 Bar. xxx. 1) and sit on God's throne of glory at the Final Judgment (1 En. li. 3, lxii. 2; cf. Matt. xix. 28, xxv. 31).

William Watson.

PHARISEES AND SADDUCEES.

In his essay under this title in the Expositor for October, 1914 (pp. 299–315), Professor Eerdmans offers us the results of his fresh investigation into the character and origin of the Pharisees and Sadducees. These results may be summarized as follows: The Pharisees and Sadducees were religious sects in the strict sense of the term. The Sadducees represented the conservative and orthodox tendency in Judaism, while the Pharisees were the more liberal-minded people, who adapted the old religion to new conditions. The origin of the two sects is eschatological in character. Both Sadducees and Pharisees were looking forward to a Messianic Age, but "the Sadducees expected a Messianic Kingdom as prophesied by the Old Testament prophets," while the Pharisees, under the influence of non-Jewish ideas, transferred the Messianic Kingdom to heaven, and made all the righteous dead, who would be resurrected, members of it. To the important question of the proper way of life in the last days of the present world the Sadducees gave a most conservative answer. "They refused to yield to Hellenistic and Persian influences, and were decided to remain 'the old people,' governed by the laws of Moses, as explained by their teachers, and believing in the prophetic books of the Old Testament. The Pharisees, on the contrary, were open to new theories." They had "more liberal tendencies, and tried to combine the religious belief of their ancestors with new opinions."

The reader who is familiar with the literature on the subject will at once recognise that Professor Eerdmans' theory

is a skilful combination of the old with the new, *plus* the very new. Like the older writers, Professor Eerdmans holds that the difference between the two rival parties was of a purely religious character. With this old view he combines the modern view, first expounded by N. Krochmal and A. Geiger, that the Sadducees were the conservative, old-world adherents of the Law of Moses, while the Pharisees were liberal Reformers who freely adopted new ideas and incorporated them into the old religion, re-shaping and re-modelling the old laws and institutions to suit the needs of changed times. To this Professor Eerdmans further adds the newest, and now almost inevitable, eschatological touch, placing the genesis of the great controversy in the different manner in which each of the two parties sought to prepare itself for the cataclysm which, we are assured, the Jews of that age expected daily to overtake the world.

But this theory, however plausible it may appear at first sight, does not accord with the well established facts recorded by Josephus and the Rabbis.

If we examine carefully the whole course of the struggle between the two parties, as described by Josephus, we shall find that the Sadducees were throughout actuated by motives of an exclusively political nature. The Sadducees strove to secure for themselves the management of the affairs of state, while the Pharisees were stoutly opposed to Sadducee rule. But whereas the Pharisees interfered in state politics only for religious ends, viz., to maintain and to extend the influence of the Law as taught by the recognised teachers of the day, the Sadducees sought power for purely political ends, and without any religious purpose in view. When they secured political power, they rarely, if ever, used it for the purpose of imposing upon the people doctrines and practices antagonistic to those in vogue under Pharisaic

influence. Josephus tells us explicitly that, whenever the Sadducees obtained office, they had to conform to the practices of the Pharisees (*Antiq.* xviii. 1, 4). This statement is corroborated by the Talmud. In Babli, Yoma 19 *b*, a Sadducee High Priest is told by his father: אע"פ שצדוקין אנו מתיראין אנו מן הפרושין. "Although we are Sadducees, yet we are afraid of the Pharisees (and therefore follow their practice)." In Niddah 33 *a*, we find a similar statement about the Sadducee women, even with regard to their conduct in the privacy of their homes. This proves conclusively that the chief, if not the only, interest of the Sadducees was of a political nature, and that their antagonism to the Pharisaic religious tendency was to them only of minor importance. It is incredible that a religious sect, particularly one of a strongly conservative character, would discard the very principles of its faith for which it had fought and struggled, just at the moment of victory, when it had achieved the power of asserting those principles and of enforcing them upon the mass of the people.

Again, if the Sadducees represented the conservative and older form of the Mosaic religion, how is one to explain the hostility with which they were invariably regarded by the broad masses of the people? On the other hand, if the Pharisees were reforming innovators who did not shrink from importing into Judaism Persian and Hellenistic doctrines and giving them Divine sanction, how was it that the tenaciously conservative masses of the Jewish people always followed them blindly even against their rightful sovereigns and High Priests (cf. *Antiq.* xiii. 10, 5)? If the Pharisees were really, as they are generally described, a small and exclusive set of supercilious, sanctimonious and narrow-minded fanatics, who shrank from all intercourse with the common people, how is one to explain the remark-

able influence which, throughout their history, they exercised over the nation? How is one to account for the readiness with which the people supported them, and upheld their authority even at the cost of insurrection against their native and foreign rulers?

The Sadducees, we are told by Professor Eerdmans, were the religiously conservative Jews, who held just to the old-world teaching of Moses, refusing to yield to the clamour for change, while the Pharisees were the liberal reformers who strove to adapt themselves to the changed needs of the time. If so, it is very strange that the conservative sect, in which the old priestly element was, if not predominant, at least very powerful, should have become staunch supporters of the upstart Hasmoneans, and acquiesced so readily in their usurpation of the High Priesthood from the old legitimate Zadokite families, whereas the liberal and opportunist Pharisees protested against this usurpation, and openly called upon John Hyrcanus, their erstwhile disciple and patron, to content himself with his secular dignities, and restore the High Priesthood to the old legitimate, presumably Zadokite, descendants of Aaron (cf. Babli Kiddushin 66*a*: רב לך כתר מלכות הנה כתר כהונה לזרעו של אהרן; Josephus, *Antiq.* xiii. 10, 5) It is also inexplicable how John Hyrcanus could have been practically all his life, viz., until the Pharisaic revolt over the High Priesthood, which took place towards the close of his rule, an eager and devoted follower of a party which, according to Professor Eerdmans, had adopted ideas and doctrines from the heathen nations against whom he and his ancestors had fought bitterly for so many years.

Josephus tells us that the Sadducees were noted for their roughness, and their lack of good manners even towards members of their own party (*Bell. Jud.* ii. 8, 4); and that they disputed the authority of their own teachers

(*Antiq.* xviii. 1, 4). These characteristics are strangely out of accord with the nature of an old-fashioned conservative party which demanded submission to authority and obedience to the ancient laws and customs. Again, the picture of the Sadducees as a conservative, God-fearing sect, described by Professor Eerdmans, is hard to reconcile with the conduct of the Sadducee priestly leaders, who violently seized the tithes from the threshingfloors, thereby robbing the poorer priests and Levites of their rightful dues (*Antiq.* xx. 9, 2; 8, 8; Yerushalmi, Ma'aser Sheni, v. 6); or with the licentiousness and barbarity of the Sadducee Alexander Jannaeus, described in *Antiq.* xiii. 14, 2. Contrast the characters of the Pharisees Onias [1] (*Antiq.* xiv. 2, 1), Sanaeas (ibid. 9, 4), Pollion (xv. 1, 1), Simon b. Gamaliel (*Vita*, 38), Gamaliel (Acts v. 34 f.), etc.

It is evident that the facts here adduced do not accord with the theory advanced by Professor Eerdmans. On the other hand, Professor Eerdmans has collected a considerable number of passages from the New Testament, Josephus, and especially from the Mishna, from which he claims to derive support for his views. It will, therefore, be necessary for us to examine these passages, and see whether his claim is justified.

Professor Eerdmans cites Matthew ix. 11, 14; xii. 2, 10; xv. 1, to prove that the Pharisees formed an organised sect distinct from the rest of the Jews, with their own peculiar regulations and observances with regard to food, the Sabbath, tithes, oaths, etc. But a little consideration will show that these passages prove just the contrary. For if the observances referred to in these passages were the peculiar and distinctive mark of a special sect, why then did the Pharisees express surprise that Jesus and His disciples did not observe them, seeing that He and His disciples were

[1] Identical with חוני המעגל of the Talmud, cf. Babli, Ta'anith 19*a*.

evidently not members of that sect? The surprise of the Pharisees at the neglect of these observances by Jesus and His disciples proves conclusively that the regulations and ordinances decreed by the Pharisees were accepted and observed by all respectable and religious Jews, and were disregarded by none, except the outcast sinners and publicans, or the Sadducees. The Pharisees, therefore, did not form a special sect, with regulations and observances distinct and separate from the rest of the Jews. Who, then, were the Pharisees, and why are they always spoken of in the New Testament and in Josephus as a distinct and separate class of people? The answer is to be found quite plainly and unmistakably in the words of Jesus reported in Matthew xxiii. 2, 3: "The Scribes and the Pharisees sit in Moses' seat: All, therefore, whatsoever they bid you, that observe and do." The Pharisees were thus the recognised teachers of the Law, the successors of Moses, the first teacher of the Divine Law, and their teaching was acknowledged even by Jesus to have binding force upon all the Jews. In other words, the Pharisees were the same class of men who, in a later period, became known as the *Rabbis*, the official expounders of Jewish law and practice, and the acknowledged leaders of the people (cf. ibid. *vv.* 6–7). They taught and practised doctrines and regulations fully accepted by the great mass of the people, and were only distinguished from the latter by their greater knowledge of the Law, and by a stricter observance of it, as befitting their character as religious teachers.

This description is in full accord with that given by Josephus (cf. *Bell. Jud.* ii. 8, 14): *Φαρισαῖοι μὲν οἱ δοκοῦντες μετ' ἀκριβείας ἐξηγεῖσθαι τὰ νόμιμα.* *Antiq.* xiii. 10, 6; xvii. 2, 4; and especially xviii. 1, 3; *Vita,* 38, etc. Professor Eerdmans makes much of the statement in *Antiq.* xvii. 2, 4, that 6,000 Pharisees refused to take the

oath of obedience to the Emperor and to Herod, and were fined. From this, Professor Eerdmans seeks to prove that the Pharisees formed a sect which numbered in the time of Herod 6,000 members. But if these Pharisees were only just an ordinary sect within the Jewish people, how is one to explain the exceptional leniency, so foreign to Herod's nature, with which he treated them for such an overt act of defiance, as compared with the rigorous and harsh treatment which he meted out to the rest of the people? The only explanation possible is that Herod was afraid to go to extremes with these 6,000, because of the honoured position which they occupied among the people, as their religious teachers and leaders (cf. *Antiq.* xv. 10, 4).

Now, if the Pharisees were the recognised teachers of Judaism, who, in the words of Jesus, "sat on the throne of Moses," and whose teaching was accepted by the people as having the binding force of the Law, it follows that the Sadducees, who opposed their teaching and repudiated their authority, did not "sit on the throne of Moses," and were really heretics to the Jewish religion. Wherein did their heresy consist? Evidently not in their strong conservatism and their strict adherence to the Law of Moses. For if so, their teaching and not that of the Pharisees would have been identified with the Law of Moses, they, and not the Pharisees, would have been regarded as sitting on the throne of Moses. Professor Eerdmans, however, asserts that in the Mishna itself, the code of later Pharisaism, "the Sadducees are described as people who are in some cases stricter than the Pharisees," and that "their opinion about clean and unclean is more rigorous than the theory of the Pharisees." But this assertion is altogether out of accord with the facts. In Nidda iv. 2 it is expressly stated that the Sadducees were very lax with regard to the impurity of menstruous women. In Yerushalmi, Hagiga

iii. 5, we find the Sadducees mocking the Pharisees for having dipped the candlestick in a ritual bath, in order to free it from some impurity, which proves that they were also lax with regard to the impurity attached to vessels. It is also significant that in the New Testament it is the Pharisees, and not the Sadducees, who are taunted for their excessive punctiliousness in matters of ritual cleanness (Matt. xxiii. 25 ff., etc.).

Professor Eerdmans adduces as evidence for his remarkable assertion Yadaim iv. 7, which he translates as follows: "The Sadducees said: We disapprove of you, Pharisees, for holding that water poured out into a basin is clean. The Pharisees answered: We disapprove of you, Sadducees, for holding that a canal that passes through a cemetery is clean." He connects this passage with another passage found in Schechter's "Fragments of a Zadokite Work" (MS. A, p. 10, lines 10–13). But the learned Professor has unfortunately misunderstood the meaning of both these passages. For the sake of clearness, we shall transcribe the passages in their original Hebrew. The passage in Yadaim runs as follows: אומרים צדוקין קובלין אנו עליכם פרושים שאתם מטהרין את הניצוק אומרים פרושין קובלין אנו עליכם צדוקין שאתם מטהרין את אמת המים הבאה מבית הקברות. Now, הניצוק does not mean "water poured out into a basin," but: "the stream of a liquid running from a clean vessel into an unclean vessel." The Pharisees declared that the lower extremity of this stream does not render the upper part of the stream also unclean (cf. *Makshirin*, v. 9, with the commentaries *ad loc.*; also Maimonides in our passage, and in *Yad Hahazaka*, *Hilkoth Tum'oth Oklin*, vii. 1). The Sadducees in our passage scoff at the scholasticism of their opponents, who found it necessary to make such a declaration, as if anybody could have thought it otherwise. Whereupon

the Pharisees retort that the Sadducees have made another declaration which sounds more foolish, viz., that water of an aqueduct running through a burial ground is clean, as if anybody could have doubted the purity of running water (cf. Lev. xi. 36). On the other hand, the passage in Schechter's Fragments deals with an entirely different aspect of the question. The passage is as follows :— אל יטהר במה כלי וכל גבא בסלע אשר אין בו די מרעיל אשר ננע בו הטמא וטמא מימיו כמימי הכלי. "No man shall purify himself with water drawn by means of a vessel (i.e., מים שאובים). And any pool in a rock which does not contain sufficient water to wrap up the human body, which an unclean person has touched, its waters shall become unclean like the waters of a vessel." [1]

From the continuation of the text in Yadaim, in which the Sadducees argue in favour of the liability of a master for the damages caused by his slaves, Professor Eerdmans seeks to prove the lack of selfishness of the rich and slave-owning Sadducees. But the passage does not state that the Sadducees actually ever paid for the damages caused by their slaves. It only gives an academic argument, which proves, by the way, two things not quite so creditable to the Sadducees, viz., firstly, that the Sadducees reduced the slave to the level of a dumb animal ; and, secondly, that they did not grasp the real grounds which underlie the laws of damages enumerated in Exodus xxi. 28 ff., grounds which cannot by any stretch of imagination be applied to human beings.

In the next paragraph of Yadaim Professor Eerdmans finds proof that the Sadducees were possessed with a spirit of deep reverence which inspired them with great veneration for the name of Moses. But this veneration for the name

[1] Cf. the writer's notes to this passage in the Hebrew periodical "Hashiloah," xxvi. 499.

of Moses is nowhere else ascribed to the Sadducees in the ancient sources. The fact is that the reading צדוקי גלילי in our common texts is an error. We should read with the Cambridge codex (cf. W. H. Lowe's edition, p. 249*a*) מין גלילי "a Galilean heretic." The reference is to a member of the Essenes, who, according to Josephus (*Bell. Jud.* ii. 8, 9), ascribed to the name of Moses a sanctity second only to that of God Himself.

Professor Eerdmans is even more unfortunate in his treatment of Yadaim iv. 6. By mistranslating this passage and misapprehending the whole trend of its argument, he manages to draw from it some startling conclusions, viz., that Rabban Johanan ben Zakkai, the leading Pharisee teacher of his generation, was on the side of the Sadducees, and that he and his Sadducee friends sought to include in the canon of Scripture "the books hammeram that are beloved." At the outset we wish to declare that it is incorrect to state, as Professor Eerdmans does, that the Hebrew term for "canonic" is "making the hands unclean." According to this absurd statement, the leather straps of the phylacteries are also "canonic," i.e., a part of the sacred Scriptures, since they, too, are said to render the hands unclean (Yadaim iii. 3). The Hebrew term for "canonic" is קדש "holy," as the Scriptures are termed in this very passage, and always elsewhere in Rabbinic literature, כתבי הקדש. The canonicity of a book was not determined by its power to defile the hands, but, on the contrary, the power of a book to defile the hands was determined by its canonicity (cf. Yadaim iii. 5). Again, it is not correct to say, as Professor Eerdmans does, that "the sacred books are supposed to communicate a certain unseen fluid to the hands that held the book." This is pure imagination. Hands which had touched the books of the Scripture were considered unclean for one particular purpose only,

viz., *the handling of food.* I have no doubt that modern bacteriologists would be quite ready, though on different grounds, to endorse this old Rabbinic rule, only they would extend it to all books, whether canonical or not. The decree which enforced this rule was promulgated at a synod held in the upper chamber of one of the notables of Jerusalem, Hananiah ben Hizkiah ben Gorion by name, about the year 70 A.D. This decree was the sequel to another decree passed by the same Synod, which declared as unclean any priestly food (תרומה) which had been caused to touch any of the sacred books of Scripture. Its purpose was to prohibit the contiguity of Scriptural books with food, so as to prevent their destruction by rats which would be attracted by the food (cf. Mishna Sabbath, i. 4, with Bertinoro *ad loc.*; Zabim v. 10, with Maimonides *ad loc.* and on Yadaim iii. 3; and Babli Sabbath 14 *a*).

We may now proceed to interpret the passage in Yadaim iv. 6, so strangely misunderstood by Professor Eerdmans. The Sadducees, with their characteristic superficiality, railed at the Pharisee doctors for declaring that hands which touch the Holy Scriptures become defiled, whereas hands that touch any secular books, such as the books of המירם, whatever that may mean, remain clean. R. Johanan ben Zakkai, wishing to silence the Sadducees, put to them this question: How is it that you accept the teaching of the Pharisee doctors, when they declare that the bones of a dead ass are clean, but the bones of Johanan the High Priest (= John Hyrcanus, who was so highly revered by the Sadducees) are unclean? The Sadducees (not the *Pharisees*, as Professor Eerdmans has it) replied: The declaration of human bones as unclean is intended for the protection of the dignity of man, to prevent any one making spoons out of the bones of his father and mother. For the very same reason, retorted R. Johanan b. Zakkai, do

we Pharisees declare that books of Scripture defile the hands, but secular books, like the books of המירם, do not defile the hands, viz., to protect the Scriptures against undignified handling, or exposure to destruction by rats. There is thus no question here of extending the canon of Scripture, any more than there is here any defection from Pharisaism on the part of its chief exponent, R. Johanan b. Zakkai.

Professor Eerdmans is also incorrect in his interpretation of Para iii. 7. His apparently imperfect acquaintance with Rabbinic law and Talmudic terminology has led him to a strange theory, that the Mishna prescribes a certain procedure in the preparation of the ashes of the Red Heifer *out of deference to the views of the Sadducees!* Again, according to Professor Eerdmans מעורב שמש is synonymous with טבול יום. This is not so. טבול יום is a person who has undergone one part of the process of purification, viz., he has taken the prescribed ritual bath, but has not yet fulfilled the second condition necessary for his purification, viz., to wait until sunset, when he would become מעורב שמש and be completely purified (cf. Lev. xxii. 6–7). טבול יום is still regarded in certain respects as unclean. His touch defiles tithes and other holy food (cf. Zabim v. 12; Maimonides, Yad Hahazaka, Hilkoth Aboth Hatum'ah, x. 1, 3). We may now proceed to discuss the Mishna in Para. iii. 17. The original text is as follows: ובית טבילה היה שם ומטמאין את הכהן השורף את הפרה מפני הצדוקים שהיו אומרים במעורבי שמש היתה נעשית (v.l. שלא יהיו). "There was there a place for ritual bathing, and they defiled the priest who was to burn the heifer because of the Sadducees who asserted (v. l. 'that they may not assert') that it had to be prepared only by such as had completed the process of their purification by the setting of the sun."

The meaning is this. The Sadducees, basing their opinion

on Numbers xix. 9, asserted that all rites in connexion with the Red Heifer must be performed by a priest who was perfectly clean, and that if the priest had met with a defilement, he could not take part in these rites, unless he had completed the full process of his purification, both having taken the ritual bath and having waited until sunset—מעורב שמש. The Pharisees, on the other hand, held that the priest need not be perfectly pure, and that, if he had met with a defilement, it was sufficient if he had taken the ritual bath, even though he had not waited for sunset. In order, therefore, to demonstrate the falsity of the Sadducee view, the Pharisees deliberately forced the officiating priest to render himself unclean by the touch of some impurity at hand, and then to take the ritual bath which they had in readiness on the Mount of Olives, where the rites of the burning of the Red Heifer were performed, and to proceed immediately to the performance of the rites before sunset, while he was still only a טבול יום. Such a demonstration against Sadducee (Boethusean) doctrine is also found in the rites attending the offering of the sheaf of barley on the first day of Passover (Lev. xxiii. 10 ff.; see Mishna Menahoth x. 3; cf. also in another case Babli Makkoth 5 *b*: להוציא מלבם של צדוקים). The variant reading שהיו or שלא יהיו, of which Professor Eerdmans makes so much, does not materially affect the meaning of the passage. The first, however, seems to be the more correct reading; cf. the expression in the passages just cited, and also in Megillath Ta'anith i. §§ 1, 2; iv. etc.

But this Mishna must not be cited as evidence of the strictness of the Sadducees in matters of Levitical purity. For, as we have shown above, it is a well established fact that the Sadducees were regarded by their opponents as extremely lax in this respect. Their insistence upon the complete cleanness of the priest who prepared the ashes

of the Red Heifer proves not their religious orthodoxy, but rather the shallowness of their exegesis. As already mentioned, they based their ruling on Numbers xix 9. But the wording of that passage proves conclusively that "a man that is clean" is not intended to be necessarily identical with the person who burns the heifer, nor is the latter necessarily identical with the priest mentioned in *vv.* 6, 7, etc.; cf. Sifré on the passage. The Pharisees, on the other hand, admitted that the officiating priest must, before proceeding to the rites, be free from impurity in order to emphasise thereby the fact that his defilement after the rites, which according to *vv.* 7, 8, 10 demanded his ritual purification, was the consequence only of his contact with the burnt heifer, and not of some other previous act. At the same time, they rightly maintained that there was nothing in the text of Scripture which demanded that the priest who burnt the heifer should be completely clean—מעורב שמש, and that perfect purity was unnecessary for a rite which itself conferred impurity upon the person who performed it. It was sufficient that the person should attain a state of purity high enough for the burnt heifer to render him again unclean, so that he may have to undergo, as a consequence of having performed the rite, the process of purification presented in *vv.* 7, 8, 10.

However, this is not the only example of the shallowness of Sadducean exegesis. We have already given above another example in connexion with the laws of damages. We shall give here a few more examples which will prove in their cumulative force that the Sadducees had but a superficial knowledge of the Law of Moses, to which they are supposed to have been attached with such touching loyalty.

They taught that on the Day of Atonement the officiating

High Priest had to kindle the incense before entering the Holy of Holies (Sifra, Ahare Motth ch. 3; Babli, Yoma 53 *a*). This they derived from the words "for I will appear in the cloud upon the mercy-seat" (Lev. xvi. 2), which they interpreted as a cloud of smoke from the incense. But further on in *v.* 13 it is expressly stated "He shall put the incense upon the fire *before the Lord*," viz., in the Holy of Holies, which proves that the "cloud" in *v.* 2 cannot refer to the smoke of incense, but only to the cloud of glory which usually accompanies the theophany in the Pentateuch.

They refused to allow monetary compensation for the damage of a limb, basing their ruling on the literal meaning of the text in Exodus xxiv. 24, and thus ignoring the fact that elsewhere Scripture implies that compensation may in such a case be accepted (Num. xxxv. 31; Exod. xxi. 30; cf. Meg. Ta'an. iv.; Babli Baba Kama 84 *a*).

They demanded that the statutory daily burnt sacrifices should be provided for by private individuals, and not from the Temple treasury, because in the Scriptural injunction relating to this sacrifice the singular is employed: "One lamb *shalt thou offer*" (Num. xxviii. 4; cf. Meg. Ta'an. i. 1; Babli, Menahot 65 *a*). But this is evidently addressed to the sacrificing priest, whereas the public and national character of the sacrifice is amply proved by the wording in *vv.* 2–3: "Command the children of Israel, and say unto them, My oblation . . shall ye observe to offer unto me. . . . This is the offering . . . which ye shall offer unto the Lord," etc.

They held that the penalty on false witnesses was to be inflicted only when their evidence had already resulted in the execution of the falsely accused (cf. Maccoth 5*b*). But this is altogether opposed to the sense of the passage in Deuteronomy xix. 16–21: "Then both the men . . . shall stand before the Lord, before the priests and the judges

which shall be in those days; and the judges shall make diligent inquisition: and behold, if the witness be a false witness, and hath testified falsely against his brother, then shall ye do unto him as he *had thought to do* unto his brother." These words obviously imply that the accused had not yet been executed; cf., Rashi's note to the passage: כאשר זמם ולא כאשר עשה. The verb זמם everywhere means "to plan," and not "to execute"; cf., especially Psalms xvii. 3; xxxi. 14; xxxvii. 12. Had the Sadducean interpretation been correct, the text would have mentioned such a vital condition explicitly.

These specimens of the exegesis of the Sadducees prove not only their ignorance of the Pentateuch, and the shallowness of their reasoning, but also their lack of real interest in the Torah and in religion as a whole. For it must be remembered that they were often called upon to administer the law, both civil and religious, as judges and priests. Yet they failed to familiarise themselves with the contents of the Torah, or with the methods by which its injunctions may be applied to the varying problems of life. Nay, when it was in their interest, they actually ruled against the express command of Scripture. Thus we find them supporting the priests who claimed as their possession the meal offering accompanying an animal sacrifice, although Scripture commands in explicit terms that this offering should be devoted to the altar (Num. xv. 4–7, 9–10, etc.; cf. Meg. Ta'an. viii.). Such conduct is not in consonance with the principles of an orthodox religious sect who made the Law of Moses their guide in life. But the fact is, as we have already indicated, that the Sadducees were neither a sect, nor orthodox, nor even religious. They were really a set of men whose aim was chiefly, or entirely, political, and who were quite indifferent to the higher claims of religion or religious law.

But, it may be urged, what about the religious doctrines of the Sadducees? Were not the Sadducees in their doctrines strictly orthodox, and standing wholly on the basis of the teaching of the Old Testament? Our answer is that the doctrines of the Sadducees were not orthodox; they were not even religious, but thoroughly irreligious. The statements of Professor Eerdmans respecting the theological differences between the Pharisees and Sadducees, like his statements on their legal and ritual differences, rest on a wrong interpretation of the sources. Our chief authority for this part of our subject is Josephus in *Bell. Jud.* ii. 8, 14, and *Antiq.* xiii. 6, 9; xviii. 1, 3. Now, it is agreed on all hands that the representation by Josephus of these sects as philosophical schools must not be taken literally. It was merely a literary conceit of his to impress his Hellenistic readers. In like manner, and with like justification, he represents the revolutionary political faction of Judas the Galilean also as a philosophical school (*Antiq.* xviii. 1, 6). In order to understand the real meaning of the facts which Josephus records in these passages, we must first translate his philosophic verbiage into the language of theology. Now, of what was Josephus thinking when he talked of the differences of these parties about εἱμαρμένη? Did he really mean to say that the ancient Jews quarrelled and wrangled about such an abstract metaphysical problem as the extent of the influence of fate on human affairs, and that they actually carried on civil wars in order to settle their differences over it? We know that the bent of the Jewish mind has always been realistic and pragmatic; that until quite late the Jew was not able to familiarise himself with purely abstract ideas; that in spite of the wealth of his religious concepts, the Jew was not able to produce a coherent system of theology until the late Middle Ages, after he had been for some cen-

turies under the influence of Neo-Aristotelianism. Is it conceivable that the Jews of the Second Temple would have been so deeply interested in such abstractions as fate or predestination, as to divide themselves into sects, and carry on over them a long and bitter struggle which eventually resulted in the destruction of their nationality? Of course it is not. What then were the Pharisees and the Sadducees fighting about? Not about metaphysical abstractions, but about the very real and very practical question, whether the Jews should form a religious people or a secular people; whether the basis of the Jewish state should be the Torah or the political ambitions of its rulers. The Pharisees, following the teaching of Moses, as interpreted by Ezra and his successors, demanded that the Jewish state should be a religious and ecclesiastical state, and its sole aim should be to promote the strict observance of the Torah, as taught by its recognised teachers. The Sadducees, on the other hand, demanded that the state should be secular, and its aims political, and that religion should, at the most, be only one of the many activities of the state life. The Pharisees were religionists who, in accordance with the teaching of the Old Testament, regarded religion as the sole basis and the whole purpose of individual and national life; the Sadducees were secularists who looked upon religion as something subordinate to the political and other interests of the nation and the individual.

The whole controversy turned on the question whether God takes cognisance of man's actions, whether He interferes in human affairs in order to direct them to a definite aim. For if He did not, it would obviously be quite unreasonable to sacrifice the national and individual interests for the sake of religion. The Pharisees answered this question, as the Old Testament had done before them, with an emphatic affirmative, the Sadducees answered

it with a more or less strong negative. By *εἱμαρμένη* Josephus means, not the theologico-philosophic doctrine of fate or predestination, but the religious doctrine of Providence, of the Divine governance of human affairs. The Sadducees, though secularists, were not atheists. They did not deny the existence of God. Such a notion was inconceivable to the pragmatic and simple mind of the Jew. They only denied God's Providence (*τὴν μὲν εἱμαρμένην παντάπασιν ἀναιροῦσι*, *Bell. Jud.* loc. cit.). It was not the concern of God whether we did good or evil (*τὸν θεὸν ἔξω τοῦ δρᾶν τι κακὸν ἢ ἐφορᾶν τίθενται*, ibid.). Man might act just as he pleased without apprehending any supernatural interference with the consequences of his actions (*φασὶ δὲ ἐπ' ἀνθρώπων ἐκλογῇ τό τε καλὸν καὶ τὸ κακὸν προκεῖσθαι, καὶ τὸ κατὰ γνώμην ἑκάστῳ τούτων ἑκατέρῳ προσιέναι* ibid.). There was no retribution in this life, nor was there any retribution after death, since death was the end of man (*ψυχῆς δὲ τὴν διαμονὴν καὶ τὰς καθ' Ἅιδου τιμωρίας καὶ τιμὰς ἀναιροῦσι*, ibid.). The Pharisees, on the other hand, taught that God ruled the world; that nothing occurred in the world except through God's Providence. At the same time, they asserted the doctrine of man's free will, and of his responsibility for his actions (*πράσσεσθαί τε εἱμαρμένῃ τὰ παντὰ ἀξιοῦντες, οὐδὲ τοῦ ἀνθρωπείου τὸ βουλόμενον τῆς ἐπ' αὐτοῖς ὁρμῆς ἀφαιροῦνται, δοκῆσαν τῷ θεῷ κρᾶσιν γενέσθαι καὶ τῷ ἐκείνης βουλευτηρίῳ καὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων τὸ θελῆσαν προσχωρεῖν μετ' ἀρετῆς ἢ κακίας*, *Antiq.* xviii. 1, 3). Professor Eerdmans has a rather long, and eloquent argument against the doctrine of fate and predestination (loc. cit. pp. 304–5), which might very well be in place when applied against the Essenes (cf. Joseph, loc. cit.) or against their later followers in this extreme doctrine; but it is altogether irrelevant against the Pharisees. Josephus in the passages cited above asserts most empha-

tically that the Pharisees, while teaching the doctrine of Divine Providence, yet did not deny free will to man. Their teaching is expressed with admirable precision by their great disciple, R. 'Akiba: הכל צפוי והרשות נתונה (Aboth. iii. 15; cf. Schechter, *Some Aspects of Rabbinic Theology*, pp. 284–9). This teaching accords completely with the doctrine implied in every page of the Old Testament. On the other hand, the Sadducee doctrine is subversive of all religion, and destructive of all religious morality.

Again, it is asserted by Professor Eerdmans that "the Sadducees rejected all these things (the doctrine of future life with rewards and punishments, and the names of the angels), as they were inconsistent with their belief in the authority of the Thora and the Prophets." But how does the acceptance of "all these things" clash with the authority of the Torah and the Prophets? Where does the Old Testament prohibit the belief in future life, in retribution after death, or in the names of the angels? (Some of the latter, it may be pointed out in passing, are actually given in the canonical Book of Daniel). The doctrine of future life and retribution must have been, in one form or another, well known to the authors of the Old Testament, if only from the Egyptian system; yet nowhere do we find it denied in the Old Testament, either expressly, or even by implication. It is simply passed by in silence. A belief in it does not, therefore, imply a weakening of the authority of the Hebrew Scriptures. Further, Professor Eerdmans is not correct when he implies that the Sadducees rejected only the names of the angels. As a matter of fact, the Sadducees rejected not only the names of angels, but also their very existence (Acts xxiii. 8). Was this rejection also due to their orthodoxy, because they found the belief in the existence of angels "inconsistent with the authority of the Thora and the Prophets"? Is not the existence of angels implied in innumerable passages

of the Old Testament, from Genesis down to Malachi? The fact is that the Sadducees denied it, not because of their orthodoxy, but because of their heterodoxy, because of their opposition to all things spiritual, and their indifference to the binding authority of Scripture.

We may now endeavour to summarise the facts established in the foregoing pages concerning the two parties, so that they may help us to solve the problem of the origin and the antecedents of the parties. The Pharisees were the recognised Teachers of the Law, who sat "upon the throne of Moses," and whose teaching was accepted as having legal authority. They were regarded by the nation as leaders and guides, and were obeyed in all matters, whether religious or political (Matt. xxiii. 2–7; Josephus, *Antiq.* xiii. 10, 5, 6; xviii. 1, 3). Their theology, though it had undergone a great development, was based chiefly on the teaching of the Old Testament. Their activity had purely religious objects in view, viz., to ensure the strict observance of the Law as interpreted by their traditions. The Sadducees, on the other hand, were secularists. Their aims were exclusively political. They regarded religion as of minor importance, and held that it must always be subordinated to the interests of the state. They would only observe of the national religion as much as, and no more than, was absolutely necessary to maintain their connexion with the people over whom they strove to rule. Hence, at the utmost, they would only observe the laws of the Pentateuch, but rejected the ordinances and regulations established by the traditions of the teachers and scribes (*Antiq.* xiii. 10, 6, etc.). Thus, they were lax in the observance of Levitical purity, the Sabbath (Mishna 'Erubin, vi. 2), and in other matters.[1] But the rejection of tradition

[1] This follows from the fact that only the Pharisees and Scribes are singled out for attack in Matt. xxiii. 15 ff.

was not to them a matter of principle. They were quite ready to observe all the traditions of their opponents, and to conform to their practices, if it served their political ends (*Antiq.* xviii. 1, 4). Their theological doctrines were strongly rationalistic and irreligious in character.

Now, it is evident that the Pharisees were none others than the direct forerunners of the teachers known in a later period as the Rabbis, and the direct successors of the men known in Rabbinic tradition as the Men of the Great Synagogue and their followers. They are identical with the class of teachers, at the head of whom stood the men enumerated in Aboth i.-ii. as the successive recipients of the Law of Moses, from Simon the Just down to R. Judah the Prince, the redactor of the Mishna. It is, therefore, utterly wrong to describe them as a *sect* in Judaism, with doctrines and practices different and distinct from the rest of their people. For they were really the representatives of the national religion, as professed and practised, more or less strictly, by the vast majority of the nation. But who were the Sadducees, and whence did they originate? They are first mentioned both by Josephus [1] and the Rabbis in the reign of John Hyrcanus. They appear already then as a well-defined set of men with a fixed policy. They surely did not spring into existence out of nothing. They must have had some beginnings, some antecedents, some progenitors to whom we may trace their character and their policy. Who was there in pre-Hasmonean Judea whom we may credit with the parentage of this secularist, anti-religionist, purely political party? Can we find in pre-Hasmonean Judea tendencies more or less akin to Sadduceeism, to which we may trace the origin and development of their political party?

[1] The mention of the three "sects" by Josephus in the time of Jonathan the Maccabee (*Antiq.* xiii. 6, 9), is evidently premature.

The reader who has followed our discussion so far will have no difficulty in finding the right answer to these questions. The parent of Sadduceeism was *Judean Hellenism*. The men who, from the beginning of the Hasmonean age down to the destruction of the Temple, had carried on an unceasing struggle against the national religion and its recognised teachers, were no others than the heirs of the defeated and discredited followers of Jason, Menelaus and Alcimus. We read in 1 Maccabees xiii. 50 that on the surrender of the citadel of Jerusalem its Hellenistic inhabitants were only expelled from the stronghold, but were not put to death, nor even exiled from the country. We must, therefore, conclude that they settled in Jerusalem as peaceful citizens, and that, though brought up as pagans, outwardly at least they must have learnt to conform to the Jewish religion. But it is not likely that they had eradicated from their hearts their inveterate hatred for the national religion and its representatives. Their old lust for power must also have revived within their hearts. In addition to this, they must also have felt a desire for avenging themselves on the Maccabees, who had destroyed their party and their power. They must soon have begun to form schemes for the overthrow of the Maccabee rulers. No doubt they found also a number of friends and sympathisers among the leading men of Jerusalem, particularly among the old priestly families, who, for one reason or another, were secretly opposed to the Maccabees and their supporters. The upshot of these secret schemings was the assassination at Dok by his own son-in-law of Simon the Maccabee (1 Macc. xvi. 16). This crime was only part of a widespread conspiracy to undo all the work of the Maccabees, and to place Judea again under the yoke of Syria. Ptolemy, the assassin of Simon and his wife and his two sons, was in league with the Syrian king, with the captains

of the Jewish army, and with some prominent men in Jerusalem, probably priests, who were to help him in seizing the army, the city of Jerusalem, and the Temple Mount (ibid. *vv.* 18–20). Now, who were the confederates of this assassin, who conspired with him to restore the Syrian servitude ? Evidently not the extreme Hassidim, nor the members of the moderate party who followed the Pharisees. They could have been none other than the survivors of the old Hellenists and their sympathizers. It shows how quickly the Hellenists had recovered their old influence in Jerusalem, that six years after the surrender of the citadel (136–142 A.D.) they had become so powerful as to attempt a revolution in the state.

However, the collapse of Ptolemy's conspiracy, and the comparative failure of the following Syrian invasion of Judea (*Antiq.* xiii. 8, 2 f.) taught these Hellenists a valuable lesson. They learnt once for all that the old methods employed by their predecessors for gaining political power over their people were now out of date, and that the only way to gain the coveted power was by attaching themselves to their own people, and even to their people's religion. In order to allay the suspicions of John Hyrcanus as to their loyalty, they must have made great efforts to gain his confidence and to prove their attachment to his person. For this purpose they were bound to show themselves loyal also to the Jewish religion. But their loyalty to the Jewish religion sprang from political and not from religious motives. Being first and foremost politicians and office-seekers, they sooner or later had to come into collision with the teachers of the Law, the Pharisees, who placed religion above politics. And thus the old Hellenistic party reappeared on the scene of history as the new party of the Sadducees, a party which stood for the aggrandisement of the state with themselves as its leaders and administrators. To attain their political

ambitions, they attached themselves to their former enemies, and henceforward became the staunch supporters of the Hasmonean dynasty. The Hasmoneans on their side, who, unlike their Maccabee ancestors, had purely political and secular aims in view, found it useful to attach to themselves this new party, and lend it their support, with the result that all the members of the dynasty were exclusively Sadducees. The only exception was Salome Alexandra, probably because of the influence of her brother, the great Pharisee teacher, Simon ben Shetah. It must also be noted that the female members of the Sadducee families, whose political ambitions were naturally not so highly developed as those of the men, were generally devotees of Pharisaism (cf. *Antiq.* xvii. 2, 4; *οἷς ὑπῆκτο ἡ γυναικωνῖτις* ; Nidda 33 *a*).

But with all their indifference or antagonism to religion, the Sadducees were often called upon to deal with religious problems. When they had realised their ambition and attained to office in the state, they had to administer the law as judges and priests. Then they had perforce to resort to the Pentateuch for guidance; but they were incapable of interpreting its all too brief, and frequently obscure, decisions, or of applying the principles of its primitive jurisprudence to the changed conditions of a more advanced and more complex state of society. The recognized religious teachers, the Pharisees, who had for generations devoted themselves to the study of the Torah and to the methods of applying it to the needs of the times, had, indeed, developed a system of interpretation which enabled them to settle all judicial and ritual problems on the basis of the Mosaic legislation. But the Sadducees, when first placed in office by John Hyrcanus, could not possibly resort to their supplanted antagonists for guidance and instruction, or accept their methods and principles of interpreta-

tion. And so they were forced to construct a system of law and hermeneutics peculiar to themselves, and differing as far as practicable from that of their opponents. They naturally followed the line of least resistance, and sought as far as possible, but not always, to interpret the Pentateuchal ordinances in a crudely literal sense.[1] In their amateurish treatment of the Scriptural text they committed many errors, but they always erred on the side of severity, with the result that they became noted for their cruelty as judges (*Antiq.* xx. 9, 1). Thus, perhaps in spite of themselves, the Sadducees established and developed a system of law and a tradition conflicting in many respects with those of the traditional teachers, the Pharisees. Owing to their ignorance of the Torah, and their lack of legal training, their decisions were of an arbitrary character, and without any Scriptural support (cf. Meg. Ta'an. ch. x.). These decisions seem to have been committed to writing at a comparatively early period for the guidance of ignorant judges. Thus, the Megillath Ta'anith ch. iv. records the abolition of the "Book of Decrees" (ספר גזירתא), which is explained, no doubt correctly, by the scholiast to have been a Sadducee compilation giving a list of penalties for certain offences, for which, however, the Sadducee judges were unable to cite Scriptural authority.

In spite, however, of this enforced scholastic activity, the Sadducees remained politicians, and always used political means for combating their opponents. It was only in the Roman period, when they had been deprived of opportunities for political and administrative activities, that we find them also engaging their opponents in religious controversies. Thus the controversies recorded in Yadaim iv. and in Megillath Ta'anith (i. 2; iv; v. 2; viii. 3) all belong to the age

[1] See our discussion of Sadducee exegesis above pp. 94–96, and cf. particularly Meg. Ta'an. ch. iv.

of Rabban Johanan ben Zakkai, who flourished 70 A.D. But the Sadducees did not enter into these religious disputations with a serious and reverent spirit, as befitted the sacred character of the subjects under discussion. Their object was mainly to poke fun at their opponents, to scoff and to rail at their over-scrupulousness. Sacred religious doctrines were to them but subjects for idle jests and cheap fun (cf. our discussion above of the passages in Yadaim *loc. cit.;* also Yerushalmi, Hagigah, iii. 5; Aboth d'Rabbi Nathan, v.; further Matt. xxii. 23 ff.). The spirit of levity and cynicism displayed by the Sadducees in their religious disputations amply confirms our diagnosis of their character. They were materialists who looked upon religion with either indifference or contempt. They sought to banish all spirituality from the life of the individual and the nation, and regarded the material life as the be-all and end-all of existence. The teachers of the Law, or the Pharisees, fought strenuously against this materialism, and strove with all their power to sanctify both the individual and the state by a strict observance of the Law, and by an insistence upon the doctrines of Divine Providence, Divine retribution, and the immortality of the soul.

Viewed from this point of view, the struggle of parties among the Jews in the period of the Second Temple no longer appears as a struggle of pedants and schoolmen over certain abstract dogmas, or certain minutiæ of ritual. It was really a conflict between two views of life, between two principles which went to the very root of the national existence. It was a struggle for supremacy between materialism and spiritualism, between the State and Religion. As such it was merely a repetition, in a slightly different form, of the struggle in the period of the First Temple between Prophet and King. And just as in the former period the Prophet triumphed over the King in the destruction of the

state and the disappearance of the Monarchy, so also in the later period Religion, in the person of the Pharisee, triumphed over materialism by the destruction of the Hasmonean state, and the total disappearance of the Sadducees.[1]

M. H. Segal.

AGAIN: THE WORK OF ST. LUKE.

In the Expositor for March 1915 Dr. Maurice Jones has written a reply to my paper on the motive and purpose of the Lukan writings, published in the Expositor for December 1914. I tried to establish the theory that St. Luke had composed his historical work as an apology for the preaching of St. Paul in the first trial of the Apostle before the Imperial court of justice. As the question of the date of Acts and the Synoptical Gospels is of vital significance to any theory about the purpose of these writings, Dr. Jones more than any one else was entitled to this reply, because a few months before in the Expositor for March 1914 he had tried to refute Harnack's conclusions about the chronological problem, defended in his different studies about the *Apostelgeschichte*, especially in his *The Dates of the Acts and the Synoptic Gospels*. In this refutation of Harnack Dr. Jones tried to show that "the preponderance of evidence is decidedly against the hypothesis that St. Luke's Gospel was written before the destruction of Jerusalem," and that, accordingly, the commonly accepted view that Acts belongs to the period between 70 and 90 A.D., "the golden age of early Christian *historical* literature," is to be considered right.

In my own paper, for brevity's sake, I could only

[1] I am indebted for a number of points in this paper to Isaac Halevy's study in his "Dorot Harishonim" (Frankfort-a.-M. 1906).

mention the principal argument against the early date, viz., the Apocalyptic section of the third Gospel as compared with those found in the other two Synoptics. As in many principal points I perfectly agree with Dr. Jones in the estimating of St. Luke's works and person, I should regret if secondary considerations were a hindrance to fundamental agreement. I hope to confine myself in the discussion to the points of really decisive significance.

I regret that several circumstances beyond my own will have delayed this rejoinder, in which I am glad to have the opportunity to honour my gallant opponent for his keen and clear criticism, by which he has contributed much to elucidate the important problem we are concerned with. Being a Dutchman (and not, as Dr. Jones supposes, a Belgian refugee), I have no claim whatever to that hospitality which our Belgian guests found and find not only in Great Britain, but also in my own little country. We are proud and thankful that God bestowed on us the task in *this* way to fulfil the high-minded word of our noble Queen-Mother, that "Holland might be great in such things in which even a little nation can be great." But though this claim to British hospitality fails me, I hope that the editor of the Expositor will find room for a few pages destined to remove some misunderstandings and to simplify an extraordinarily complicated, many-sided and ambiguous problem. A really satisfactory solution of the Lukan problem, as much as possible free from aprioristic considerations, and from scientific dogmatism, beyond doubt would be of extremely great importance both for the early history of Christianity and for the synoptical problem. But it is equally clear, and may be confirmed, e.g., by a look into the outlines of the different questions which Hoennicke has given in his introduction to his exegetical explanation of Acts,[1] that in most

[1] Dr. Gustav Hoennicke, *Die Apostelgeschichte*, Leipzig, 1913.

cases the argument can be reasoned in *utramque partem*, and that in order to avoid useless discussions we have to confine ourself as much as possible to facts and dates which are clear in themselves.

Before discussing the problem, it is only fair to say that afterwards it was found out that I was not the first to establish the theory. I knew of Kreyher, whom I mentioned in my previous paper on the subject as having been led in somewhat similar direction by his studies on Seneca. But Professor Windisch here in Leiden, having read my article, told me that Weiss (in his *Einleitung*,[3] 1897, S. 540 f.) has an annotation running thus: "Aberle fasse auch Acta als Vertcidigung gegen die wider Paulus schwebende Anklage." Further inquiry led to the result that probably the notice of Weiss had been derived from Meyer's *Kommentar zur Apostelgeschichte*,[3] 1861, S.9, but only Ewald in his *Jahrbb. der bibl. Wissenschaft*, vii. 1855, S. 167 f. gives a criticism which showed that at least he has read the paper of Aberle, which for the rest seems entirely to be neglected and forgotten. The fact is that Aberle, in *Theol. Quartalschr.*, 1855, S. 173–236, has given an exegetical study "on the purpose of Acts" in which with some modifications, due partly to the unconscious influence of Tübingen *Tendenzhypothesen*, he proposed fundamentally the same theory to which my own studies had led me. It may be somewhat disappointing for the present writer to see that the priority of his theory belongs to a scholar of nearly sixty years ago. On the other side this fact confirms its probability. When three different scholars, a Roman Catholic, a Latinist and a Protestant theologian, in different times, by different ways, without knowing anything of one another, come to the same results, this seems to me a strong evidence in favour of the simplicity and probability of the theory. Ewald's criticism, however, was not exactly encouraging:

"Wir sehen am Ende hier nichts als wie völlig ungesund und tiefverdorben sowohl die Baur'sche als die Päpstliche Theologie in Tübingen ist." And this criticism may have contributed to bury the article of Aberle in oblivion. I am persuaded when Aberle's prudent study, which, however, for others just as for me it will be difficult to lay hands on, will be read, it will receive its due honour.

Refraining, as I said, as much as possible from all doubtful argument, I want to eliminate at first two misunderstandings, the first of which I am sorry to be likely to have caused myself. Dr. Jones thinks (p. 231) that "we can form a fairly accurate idea of the kind of *apologia* that Luke thought suitable to meet the charges which St. Paul had to face by studying the speeches which the Apostle is represented as having delivered in his own defence." Now I perfectly agree with Dr. Jones that these speeches are approximately correct *reproductions* (not transcriptions) of historical Pauline apology. But I have been far from meaning to say that such a kind of *apologia* was intended by St. Luke. Accepting as historical the information of 2 Tim. iv. 16 that nobody has defended (*παραγίγνεσθαί τινι*, *adesse alicui*, *postulari pro aliquo*) St. Paul in his first answer, St. Luke, even if he had been qualified for such a task, which only Romans of high rank and influence could have fulfilled, is immediately excluded in this respect. And even when he had been called to this service, we may be sure that he would not have been so entirely devoid of tact that he would have tried to recite a historical exposition as his two *λόγοι* really are. I am sorry when I have expressed myself so incorrectly, that this inference has been made from my words, the incorrectness of which, I hope, may be forgiven to a foreign author.

The service, I meant to say, which St. Luke, according to my view, has paid to St. Paul and to the juridical position

of Christianity in the Empire was this: he wished to afford to the members of the Imperial council of justice, who for the greatest part we may be sure had only a very inadequate idea of Christianity and of Christians,[1] a historical information, correct, complete, accurate, by which they could get an exact view of St. Paul's case, and at the same time to counteract, just by this historical information, those hostile influences which, not only in the mob, but in the immediate *entourage* of the Emperor were at work against Christian preaching. Whether St. Luke has succeeded completely in his design, whether he has not left out something which was necessary and told something which could be disposed of, we may leave undiscussed. But that his writings show numerous features which justify such a conception of his work, especially the studies of Sir W. Ramsay have demonstrated abundantly. Whether this attempt could bear an official character, so that his "apology" could be embodied in the *dossier* of the trial, we may doubt. But to be effective, it could as well be sent privately to the members of the Council, provided that the author was aware of the conditions to which the apology had to answer. That St Luke was aware of these, I have tried to show in my previous article, and so the name *juris studiosus* was not undeserved.

A second point which I should like to remove from the discussion, is that which Dr. Jones touches towards the end of his reply. "It seems to me," he says, "that we are doing less than justice to St. Luke himself and to his noble

[1] There is no proof whatever *in St. Luke's work* that "Theophilos" was a catechumen, which only is a late tradition. The word κατηχεῖσθαι, in St. Luke's own works and in contemporary profane Greek, means "to have heard something, to have got some incomplete knowledge about a matter." I should say we ought to retain in the prologue the *Lukan* sense of the word and not to introduce an exegesis under influence of the later use of the word and of late tradition.

compositions if we regard them merely as a defence, whether of St. Paul personally or of Christianity as a whole. "... The message of the Angel: 'I bring you good tidings of great joy which shall be to all people' (St. Luke ii. 10), is a better description of the motive and scope of St. Luke than any words we can invent." Now, to my view, the preaching of the Gospel is not merely that which is done with the express and conscious intention of doing so, but may be done, sometimes even more effectively, by the simplest deed of love (Matt. x. 42; xxv. 34 f.; xxvi. 13); and the companions of the man who wrote 1 Cor. x. 31 cannot have found that the defence of St. Paul and of Christ's cause in such a critical moment of history was a scope not worthy of him and of his utmost endeavour.

It is just one of those extremely elucidatory remarks of Sir W. Ramsay, that St. Paul insisted upon his being brought before the Imperial tribunal,[1] because only this highest tribunal would give "an authoritative and for the time final judgment." And St. Luke, I should say, has shown that he understood the high importance of this trial as well as St. Paul himself. This remark throws light upon the whole narrative of Acts. When, however, Sir W. Ramsay denies the name of "apology" to the work of St. Luke, saying that it was "not an apology but an appeal to the truth of history," I should say that such an appeal is the only true and impressive apology. Apart from the fact that it is no concern of ours to determine what scope St. Luke ought to have considered worthy of him, it was not so much St. Paul personally who was concerned in the trial as rather the cause of Christ, as preached to Jews and Gentiles

[1] It is a common error, which may be read even in *Preuschen's Commentary on Acts*, that in Acts xxviii. 18 the Jews have forced St. Paul to do what in xxv. 10 is done by St. Paul on his own initiative. Acts xxviii. 19 says only that the contradiction of the Jews *obliged* St. Paul to appeal unto Caesar, to get his right. Of *Legendenbildung* I find no trace here.

equally, to defend this cause before the highest earthly tribunal may be considered a scope worthy of any Christian missionary.

Dr. Jones cannot accept the scheme and plan I saw in the work of St. Luke. He accepts the conception of Harnack and many others, that Acts is "destined to describe the progress of the Gospel across the world from Jerusalem to Rome." Of course, though Dr. Jones accepts this formula from Harnack, this acceptance is just as little "based upon the authority" of Harnack as were my own conclusions about the πραιτώριον of Philippians i. 13, or the στρατοπεδάρχης of Acts xxviii. 6, and of the very intimate knowledge on the part of Seneca of St. Paul and his teaching (which, by the way, I am *not* prepared to endorse) [1] are based upon the authority of Zahn. Dr. Jones, of course, bases his opinion about this plan of the work on the facts as he sees and explains them. But it seems to me that in this way the facts are explained very

[1] The case of Epictetus, of whom it is certain that he has known Christianity, shows how difficult it is to make probable any direct influence of Christian writings upon Stoics; but it shows at the same time how great the parallelism was between Christian practice and Stoic wisdom. That a man like Seneca has been willing to listen to a man like St. Paul and to take notice of Christian teaching when it reached him, may be accepted as certain. To say more we are not justified. On the question of the πραιτώριον we need not quarrel. For my thesis it is irrelevant. I only want to observe that when I infer from Acts xxviii. 30 that St. Paul had been removed from his "own hired dwelling" and had been transported to another sort of custody, this has been done only in regard to the beginning of the trial. So there is as little reason to speak of a "gedrücktere Lage" as to judge that this removal should contrast with the "cheerfulness and the hopefulness" of the Epistle to the Philippians. This hopefulness depended on the expectation of acquittal, not on the sort of custody." As for the στρατοπεδάρχης = *princeps peregrinorum*, Mommsen's conjecture has not convinced me. There is no proof that this post existed before the time of Severus; there is only one MS. of the Old Latin version which gives the translation *princ. pereg.* for στρατοπ., the other copies read *praefecto*; the Old Latin version is surely not earlier than the existence of this new post in Rome; so its reading represents no old tradition, but a free translation. I see no reason to abandon the traditional translation which in itself seems perfectly clear.

unsatisfactorily. More than once Dr. Jones grants that St. Luke in the second (and greater) part of Acts confines himself to St. Paul and his work, that the thread of narrative when other missionaries are concerned is cut short in an unexpected manner, and that as soon as the great Apostle appears no other missionaries seem to exist. That Paul was "the main instrument in the progress of the Gospel" explains that "attention is concentrated upon him," but not that the other missionaries are neglected and seem to deserve not the least attention when St. Paul has come on the scene. Dr. Jones explains this by the theory that "the great Apostle is working on Imperial lines" and "finally planted the truth of the Gospel in the Imperial capital itself." I confess to understand only imperfectly what is meant by those "Imperial lines," as, for instance, I cannot see why Alexandria should not be on these lines.

But when the planting of the Gospel in Rome is supposed to be the crown of this working on Imperial lines, St. Luke himself in Acts xxviii. 15 and St. Paul in his Epistle to the Romans overturn this theory at once. The Gospel was preached, the church was founded in Rome *before* St. Paul came there; by whom we may leave undecided, but certainly not by St. Paul. And when Acts i. 8 is said to be the Lukan expression of which Harnack's formula "from Jerusalem to Rome" is the paraphrase, we have only to repeat, Rome is not the end but the centre of the world. And why is it then only narrated of St. Paul that he came to Rome, and not of St. Peter or of any other missionary who first preached the Gospel in the Imperial capital? And when, to cite another tradition, Johannes Marcus preached in Alexandria, why is this "great city of an Imperial province" utterly neglected, and why, after the controversy of Acts xv. 39 is Johannes Marcus lost to sight?

Granted, however, that all this is explained by the extraordinary prominence of St. Paul and his work in the preaching of the Gospel, we have a right to ask: was the situation in which St. Paul at Rome is described at the end of Acts really such that "the final scenes in St. Paul's life are no longer relevant and find (therefore) no place in the narrative?" He was there, yes, but as a prisoner; he preached there, and without hindrance, but the final trial stood before, and every moment, as a sword of Damocles; the danger was menacing that the presence of St. Paul might prove to be, not conducive, but pernicious to Christianity. The crisis in his fate had to come yet; St. Luke, as well as St. Paul,[1] was persuaded that this trial would "turn to St. Paul's salvation." But no certainty was acquired as long as acquittal had not been obtained and freedom of preaching the Gospel had been secured by a verdict of the Emperor. To say that this "final scene" is irrelevant, is to disregard the whole tone and tendency of the narrative.

Dr. Jones himself feels the difficulties; he sees the "palpable difference in St. Luke's method of treating St. Paul's ministry at Rome and the detailed treatment his work in less important cities has received," and finds that the closing paragraph does "not display the Lukan style at its best." To me this depreciation of St. Luke's style in this paragraph is not exactly a convincing argument. Dr. Jones tries to explain this fault of style only by repeating the argument of his former study, that anything beyond the coming of St. Paul to Rome was irrelevant and unnecessary to the narrative. I think scarcely any one will find this argument a really simple explanation, especially of

[1] Philippians i. 19. I have not been convinced by the arguments that the "epistles of captivity" were written from an imprisonment in Ephesus.

this lack of style. If I see rightly, there is no question about any weakness of style. The early date of Acts conceded, and accepting for a moment the theory that St. Luke wrote for information of the Roman officials themselves, all becomes clear and the short paragraph expressive in every detail. The fact that St. Paul had been in custody for two years under the Roman officials explains perfectly the brevity of this part of the work. The closing words are "full of significance" indeed: destined for Roman jurists every word gets its weight and its *pointe*, as I have tried to show. It is very decidedly not the broad spreading of Christianity nor "its endless ramifications," which Acts tries to describe, but the whole work tends to this end: St. Paul in Rome, standing for Christ's cause, standing before the Emperor's tribunal, awaiting his acquittal and the freedom of preaching the Gospel. This end, this man, in this moment and in this position of his life the whole book is aiming at. So not only for the sake of solidity and equilibrium, but also from historical exactness, I should not like to enter upon Dr. Jones' conception of an *inverted* pyramid as the plan of the work, I should rather leave the base at the bottom.

A vital question to this conception is the unity of plan for Gospel and Acts together. Dr. Jones thinks that the prologue to the Gospel, especially the verses 1 and 2, exclude the conception that Acts is included in the narrative of the "matters which have been fulfilled among us," and for which "those who from the beginning were eyewitnesses and ministers to the word" were St. Luke's authorities. Now the terms of the prologue are in many respects of a perplexing ambiguity, as may be established by any one who compares the various interpretations. But this at least is perfectly clear, that the words ἀπ' ἀρχῆς cannot be taken in their strictest sense: e.g. that *all* St. Luke's authorities

have been eyewitnesses from the very beginning, i.e. from the days that the angel appeared to Zacharias (Luke i. 5 ff.). St. Luke can only mean to say that for all portions of his narrative from the beginning till the end he derives his material from eyewitnesses. What this statement means before a Roman court is clear, and besides it explains why St. Luke takes care to introduce himself as an eyewitness whenever he can, but it says nothing about the extent of the narrative. On the other hand, the words ἐπεχείρησαν ἀνατάξασθαι διήγησιν tell about the writers and intentions and contents of those concurrent narratives nothing but that, according to St. Luke, they have not fulfilled their task irreprehensibly. Else there would have been for St. Luke no reason to do it over again. We may be fairly sure that the Gospel of St. Mark belonged to those writings, but this Gospel breaks off incomplete, and we cannot know how far its author has wished to go in his description of the "Gospel of Jesus Christ," the beginning of which he reckons from the preaching of John the Baptist (Mark i. 1).[1] But not only the opening words of the Gospel of St. Mark (or is it its title ?), but also Hebrews ii. 3 and St. Luke himself in Acts i. (ἤρξατο ὁ Ἰησοῦς ποιεῖν τε καὶ διδάσκειν) show that early Christians did not limit the "Gospel" to the preaching and earthly life of our Lord.

Moreover, we are inclined to think only of Christian Gospels in Luke i., but we are sure that not only Christians, but the Jews too, have given their own, and hostile, represen-

[1] Dr. Jones seems to share the common conception that the writing of Gospel literature began only after the death of the Apostles Peter and Paul. This is, however, a very old dogmatic construction and a historical misunderstanding, which for Iren. iii. 31 has been corrected by Chapman (*J. Th. St.*, 1905, July, p. 563 ff.) The necessity of providing a written record about the words and works of our Lord must have been felt even at the time when the Apostles were living; they were not omnipresent.

tation of those matters. St. Matthew's Gospel, Justin's Dialogue with Trypho, Celsus' polemic work, the Jewish Toledoth Jesu are abundant proof of Jewish polemic parallels to Christian historiography, *the greater part of which must have originated from sources which existed before the fall of Jerusalem*, the significance of which is immoderately underrated by Dr. Jones. I refrain from making any suppositions about the writings St. Luke meant to substitute or to counteract by his work; the fact is that directly we know little or nothing about them. I only mean to say that the words of the Preface to St. Luke's Gospel tell nothing about the extent of the following narrative, and the introductory *résumé* (not preface!) which Acts i. 1 ff. gives distinctly tells us that the Gospel was planned as the *beginning* of the work and teaching of Jesus.

All argument, however, is in vain, if an early date of (Gospel and) Acts is really impossible. Professor Windisch writes me: "If reasons of great moment did not make me consider your date for the Lukan writings impossible, I could accept your hypothesis." I suppose that the arguments which to Professor Windisch are decisive against the early date (and against the Lukan authorship too) of Gospel and Acts are not so for Dr. Jones. He sums them up thus: "The legendary character of many parts; the false descriptions in Acts xv. and the false characteristic of St. Paul in general." These points are not in discussion between Dr. Jones and me, so they can be left aside. But what remains, then, when these arguments fail? It is a rather weak position which Dr. Jones occupies in his conclusion about Acts: "I am not prepared to assert positively that the Acts could not have been written before the death of St. Paul, but a detailed examination of Harnack's proof has demonstrated that the contents of the book do not demand such a date." Such an antagonism

is half-way convinced. With respect to the Synoptics, Dr. Jones acknowledges that "there is no inherent difficulty in dating the Second Gospel before the year 60," but for the Third, apart from the "voice of criticism," which is "all but unanimous in its opposition to Harnack's early dating the Gospel," there are three arguments against such an early date: the apocalyptic section of St. Luke pointing definitely to a period later than the destruction of Jerusalem; the acquaintance with the works of Josephus, and the declaration in the prologue, "that many have taken in hand to draw up a narrative," which is considered impossible before 65 A.D. Of these arguments, the first has not been repeated in Dr. Jones' reply to my study; so it seems he no longer thinks it decisive; the third has been discussed already; there remains the argument from Josephus, a really very weak one; at the best we cannot come beyond a mere possibility, not even to probability. If it were right St. Luke could not very well have written before 80–90 to know only the *earlier* works of Josephus, and he must have been an old man then: and we cannot say that St. Luke either in his Gospel or in Acts displays any sign of senility. If on that argument the whole theory of the later date must be built, I fear it will soon break down entirely.

What is then the evidence *against* so late a date for Gospel and Acts? For the Gospel any decisive proof is hardly to be expected as the prologue to my view affords no definite and evident information. But as Acts at all events is the second work, the date of the Gospel depends in this respect upon that of Acts. I confine myself to two points which seem decisive:

1. The position of the Jews.

2. The estimation of Roman justice.

1. In Acts the Jews are still a spiritual and political power, which has influence before the Roman court. A

distinct tendency throughout Acts is to counteract this influence and, what is yet more remarkable, to show that the Jews have no right to exclude St. Paul from the Jewish nation and religion (cf. e.g. xxi. 22 ff.; xxiii. 6; xxiv. 14 ff.; xxv. 8; xxvi. 4 ff., 22 f.; xxviii. 17, 20), and in this respect St. Luke perfectly agrees with St. Paul himself (Rom. xi. etc). *This claim of Jewish nationality and religion has lost all significance after the fall of Jerusalem.*

2. It is possible that in—say—the year 80 a Christian expects from Roman justice the acknowledgement of Christian teaching and practice as not contrary to Roman Imperial principles of State and Government. Such a Christian might consider the Neronian persecution as a merely personal deed of hostility and madness (which it really was) and so he might leave it aside in judging Roman Imperial conduct towards Christianity. But it is impossible that a Christian who *knows* that under Nero St. Paul, and with him many martyrs, have been put to death, should write a history of St. Paul's missionary work up to his first trial at Rome, in which not only no trace whatever of this fact can be discovered, but which is written with the evident conviction that the same Emperor as the personification of Roman Justice will acquit St. Paul and set him free to preach the Gospel as St. Paul had done already for two long years under the eyes of the Roman officials. If St. Luke had known the end of the second trial, the last word of Acts, which surely not without significance stands in its prominent place as the crown of the narrative, would be not only meaningless, but *in its tendency* nearly equal to a lie.

And what is gained by the theory I tried to establish?

1. The problem of the closing paragraph of Acts is not only satisfactorily explained but every word, especially the final one, gets its full weight in the crowning "peroration" of St. Luke's narrative.

2. The perplexing combination of the title κράτιστος with a "name" as Theophilos in the prologue, becomes clear. I have once more and as completely as I could do, inquired after the evidence, both of κράτιστος and of θεόφιλος. I have found in none of the numerous contemporary cases the title κράτιστος used in combination with not genuine Roman names of high officials, and, on the other side, I found no instance of θεόφιλος as a name of a man of rank. A γραμματεύς, a ἱερεύς, a μελανηφόρος (i.e homines qui nigris vestibus indutis deorum Aegyptiorum sacris intererant," Dittenberger, *Sylloge*,[2] p. 559) are called so, all simple folks. So that the explanation of Hieronymus (*Anecd. Mareds.* iii. 3. 20): "*Theophilus* ille amicus vel amator dei," may be accepted as right. Then θεόφιλε in the prologue of the Gospel and Acts i. is an adjective, and the name of the high official to whom the preface is directed has been left out. If my theory, that different members of the Imperial Council received a copy, is right, this omission of the proper name becomes clear. It has to be explained in the same way as sometimes the omission of ἐν Ἐφέσῳ in the address of the Epistle to the Ephesians is explained. As Dr. Jones agrees with me that "the whole trend of the narrative (in Acts) is to define the friendly relations which existed between the Christian religion in the person of its greatest and most renowned exponent and the Empire as represented by the Imperial officials of the provinces" I suppose he will not find this vocative θεόφιλε improper to the present case. The address itself, in which of course was mentioned the proper name of the person to whom a copy of the book was directed, was not incorporated in the preface, but, as usually, attached to the outer side of the roll.

3. The diversity of texts. The problem of the β text in Acts is a very complicated one, as is that of the Western

text in general, and I do not expect that von Soden's results will be generally accepted. To my view, mainly three kinds of variations may be distinguished: 1. those which are common to any text which is transmitted by writing; 2. those which are due to the use of the pericopes as lections; the variations of this kind occur generally at the beginning of a pericope, and bear a paraphrastic character; 3. various readings which can only be explained as alterations by the author himself. This last kind of variations is especially clearly marked there where material additions are made, the correctness of which cannot be doubted, but for which no plausible reason whatever can be found out, e.g., the seven *βαθμοί* of xii. 10. When St Luke himself wrote or dictated several copies, which had to be despatched at once, these variations are easily explained.

4. In this way, better than with the "Imperial lines," of Dr. Jones, the fragmentary character of the narrative, as far as other missionaries than St. Paul are concerned, is explained. And even out of St. Paul's missionary work a selection has been made, which in this way we may account for (Ramsay, *St. Paul*, p. 304 ff.). The founding of the Church and the preaching of the Gospel is told only in so far as it was necessary in order to understand the kind of conflict between the Jews and St. Paul, the Christian missionary: the rest, however important, is left in the shadow.

Secondary points I leave undiscussed. I understand that it is difficult to give up a critical tradition which for scores of years reigned almost undisputed. I can only wish that the theory may be tried as a working hypothesis, that it may prove the measure of its probability.

St. Luke has written a defence for St. Paul in the crisis of his fate. He has done more, though unconsciously. He has preserved to posterity the history of the growth of the early Church, and what is more still, he has "brought good

tidings of great joy which should be to all people"; he did so because he wrote as a Christian.

D. Plooij.

THE WORK THAT CHRIST HAS DONE.

IV.

The finished work of Christ was one of the most impressive and vital elements of faith in the preaching of the past generation. The form of words still remains with us, though we may not hear them so frequently or with the same tone of dogmatic insistence. But the meaning has changed. There can be no doubt that in their former use a quantitative theory of Atonement prevailed. The word "finished" of itself gave support to the idea that the sacrifice on the Cross was an equation of a fixed amount of suffering with a fixed amount of sin, past, present and future. In our time the accent has been placed on quality rather than quantity. And this change of opinion has considerably modified the place which was formerly occupied by the Cross in the Christian Faith. If it is quality that matters most, we shall be inclined to take more account of the life of Christ, for it is the life that makes the death so precious. The death of Christ has come to be regarded as the most dramatic and the final moment in the unfolding of the Divine Person; but it is no longer regarded as the essential moment of the finished work. We have discovered a pronounced sympathy with the Greek Fathers, who professed to find the distinctive feature of Christianity in the Incarnation; and it was a healthy enough instinct that led to this turn of interest. The Gospels were henceforth studied and interpreted with a new inspiration, and the world has been

consequently enriched by the discovery of the human portrait of Christ.

But the modern estimate of the Person of Christ has shown signs of failure. The exhaustive quest for the historical Jesus has ended, as Schweitzer admits, in the sceptical conclusion that such a person may never have existed. The preaching of our fathers was at least safeguarded against the disappointing accidents of historical study by a sublime, if dogmatic, faith in the divine Person. And although the preaching of the past can no longer be reproduced simply because it would no longer appeal to us, the preaching of to-day must discover again the soul of that preaching, if the Christian Gospel is to continue to be the burden of its message. We wish, then, in this article to maintain that the Finished Work of Christ has as much real meaning for us as for our fathers. It is the work demanded by the proleptic ideas of Religion inspired in men's hearts by God, a work which Jesus Christ alone completely achieved.

We are obliged to ask whether there is not something more in the work of Christ than a sublime example to be imitated. It must always be an example to us, but there is something in that work which we are not able to imitate. It is not what we have in common with Jesus, but what is incommunicable in Him, that is essential when we speak of His Finished Work. We may not be able to define exactly what was finished. But from the point of view of criticism alone, it is an honest and sane starting-point to accept the fact that IT meant something well defined to Jesus, something demonstratively outstanding from all other works, not only of men but of His own. It was at least so far defined in His mind that He believed it to be an absolute necessity in the interests of the race.

Every age is entitled to feel that it has been wronged by the past. But if the preaching was at fault in point of

expression, there was perhaps more intelligence behind it than we are able to discern. Calvin recognised that the atonement was not a three hours' transaction on Calvary, nor the work of a life of thirty-three years (*Instit.* Bk II. ch. 16. § 4). It is only when the divine Sonship of Christ is recognised, His unique relation both to God and to men, that His death has any outstanding significance. However remote from our intelligence the dogmatic definition of the divine person may be, the fact of the belief was there as it can hardly be said to exist to-day. It may indeed be the case that we have a truer conception of Jesus, but what we have gained in truth we seem to have lost in strong affection. If our belief in the divine Person to-day, differently expressed of course as it must be, has a corresponding reality to the faith which inspired the Church throughout the ages, it will be found that the death of Christ still occupies the central place in the Finished Work. The fact is that the spectacle of the suffering Saviour has drawn, does draw, and there is every reason to believe will continue to draw mankind to God as no other virtue or power can do—"And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto me." If we wished to put the defect of the old theology in a sentence, it was this: it formulated a theory of the divine Person which would explain the facts of Christianity, and that gave an interpretation of the facts and something over as usually happens in theoretical construction. Hence the articles of belief in a well-defined pre-existence, duality of nature in a single person without confusion, and many more, which are not essential to our belief in the divine Person and may even be inconsistent with that belief. What we do want is not a theory of the divine Person which can interpret the facts, but an idea of the divine Person which is exhaustively explained by the facts of Christian history and experience—that and nothing more. Anything

beyond that may be right or may be wrong ; it only becomes the occasion of endless and fruitless logomachy.

The Finished Work, as it was defined in Christ's own mind, was, that He was sent to glorify God—"I have glorified Thee on the earth ; I have finished the work Thou gavest Me to do." There are two moments in this work : He glorified God by impersonating His Forgiveness and his Reconciliation.

The Forgiveness of God was already known to Elemental Religion. But by enacting it in His own person, Jesus Christ contributed to it a new and vital power hitherto unknown. Here we see the incommunicable element in the Person of Christ. He was not in the position of one who realises God's forgiveness on His own account and then declares it to others. He claimed to need no forgiveness ; He claimed to declare the divine forgiveness exclusively on behalf of mankind. Others, like Hosea, were able to preach the love of God with saving power as they had known it in their own experience. But Jesus alone seriously claimed and confirmed His claim to declare God's forgiveness *from God's point of view.* He exercised God's forgiveness in His own right and not from the point of view of the forgiven. That feature of the self-consciousness of Jesus is incommunicable—a thing that cannot be imitated or reproduced. For the first and only time in history God's forgiveness was enacted in the stead of God. Therefore the first and cardinal point in the doctrine of Atonement must be, not that Jesus took our room and stead, but that He stood in the stead of God towards us. This is the new element contributed by Jesus to Religion. Hitherto God's forgiveness had been mediated through the experience of the forgiven. In Jesus it was declared as from God who forgives.

Besides Forgiveness there must be Reconciliation. To

be effective, Forgiveness must be confirmed by a moral experience which makes it possible for the offender to accept forgiveness. There must be some form of expiation to neutralise, not the fault or its consequences only, but chiefly the bad conscience which the fault engenders and which tends to feed upon the better self. Sin cannot be resolved by a simple affirmation of pardon. We recognise with Adam Bede that there's a sort of wrong that cannot be made up for.

At this point there seems to be a parting of the ways between the old and the new. Formerly the Atonement was represented in the following way: This moral debt is freely cancelled by God's mercy in Christ—the expiation which Reconciliation demands has made Forgiveness effective. To this the modern mind has replied with some scorn that no self-respecting man would be satisfied with such an arrangement. He might be thankful to know that things had been squared, so that the consequences of his actions were not so disastrous as they had threatened to be. But he has not squared accounts with his own conscience. Indeed he might feel happier to bear the burden of his guilt alone, for then he would be doing something to atone his fault. But now his self-respect has been ignored.

We believe this to be a fair statement of the modern attitude to what is known as the Atonement. And we must say that the feeling of scorn is justified. There is no doubt that Christianity, when cheaply preached and practised, has even made worthless men of indifferent men. What the decent, self-respecting man of to-day sticks at is the rotten sentimentality with which the convert so easily and readily accepts forgiveness. I have recently come across a patient in the Venereal Hospital in France who was distinctly of that type. I do not suggest for a moment that his religion was worthless or that he was incapable of

sincerity. But he was certainly not an example to copy. He professed to have been awakened and changed under my preaching, and it was grateful enough to see him mount the platform and give his testimony, as we all thought, with commendable courage before his fellow-patients. He had previously been an evangelist and was married. But I was struck cold by the facility with which he counted on the forgiving disposition of his wife and the want of moral appreciation he showed in his whole attitude. I learnt that he had previously offended more than once in the same way, and I am prepared to hear that he will do it again. Well, that sort of man must take the way that is with him. He was born that way, and it may not be possible for him to work out his salvation in any other. But surely that is not the form of Reconciliation that will commend itself to the man who has a deep sense of penitence and of what it requires of him? Yet it is unfortunately true that in certain types of preaching the Atonement accommodates itself to this wretched sentimentality, which is only too thankful to accept a salve and get away from the misery of true repentance. As an offset to this morbid religion, we may quote the following lines from a poem which was recently found on the dead body of a private in one of the Australian battalions. The poem is addressed to Jesus:

> "I would not to Thy bosom fly
> To shirk off till the storms go by;
> If you are like the man you were
> You'd turn in scorn from such a prayer."

But when due allowance is made for this crude understanding of Reconciliation, something remains which it is even worth the while of the self-respecting man to understand. So long as it is only a case of being reconciled to outward and visible consequences as they affect others, we agree that the nobler way might well be to suffer alone

than to accept the help of another even though it were God. But strictly the full appreciation of the consequences of conduct is in proportion to the consciousness of guilt, the distinction between outward consequences as they affect others and the inward effect of conduct on one's own conscience being an abstract distinction. And the question we propose to the self-respecting man is this : Has he sufficiently considered the difference between a debt to others and a debt to himself ? So far as his duty to those whom he has wronged is concerned, he *must*—all the more if he happened to be a pardoned Christian convert—do everything that can be done to expiate his fault, he and nobody else. But when it is his own conduct that is in question, his duty to others presupposes a debt which he owes to his own soul ; and this inward consequence of his conduct is the more decisive of the two, for it is his consciousness of guilt that gives all the moral significance to the outward consequences of his conduct in his own eyes. There is then something in the nature of a debt or burden still remaining which self-respect may not be called upon to bear alone. Is it indeed disrespectful to oneself to accept the help of another in bringing about reconciliation with oneself ? Has the self-respecting man considered that, when he contemplates reconciliation with himself, he has reached an abyss which has no bottom and that he essays a work which man was never expected to do alone ? If he knows the disposition of not being ever able to forgive himself, may he not be most honourably thankful to accept the help that will bring about the reconciliation ? If he knows that disposition sincerely, he will certainly be thankful ; for reconciliation to oneself is reconciliation to a sense of guilt that transcends all statutory standards and forms of measurement—in the long run it is reconciliation to God. It is God who must bear the heavier part of the burden. To bring about a reconciliation, to make

effective the thought and promise of forgiveness, that must always be regarded as a miracle of divine grace. It is God and God only who atones—not by means of any extraneous sacrifice, but through the same eternal spirit of self-sacrificing love with which He offers forgiveness. And when a man feels his need of it and is led by the Spirit of God to accept this divine grace, he will not be too curious to reason how such a thing can be. It is enough to know that there is forgiveness with Him, and that by His forgiveness the wounds of conscience may be healed. As Dante would put it, there is no repentance in heaven: "here we repent not, but smile; not at the sin, which cometh not again to mind, but at the Virtue that ordered our lives and made provision for all contingencies." (*Paradiso*, Canto 9.) Though it sounds dangerous doctrine for us who have yet to live on earth, it may be allowed to pass as a poetic sentiment; but it does at least envisage the effect of Reconciliation as the work of God.

Now, here again, Jesus Christ stands forth as the mediator between God and mankind, and here also there is something incommunicable in His work that cannot be imitated or reproduced. We can and do suffer for one another's faults and help to some extent to expiate the guilt, but not as Christ atones. The atonement He has wrought is not simply the saving help one may expect from a man who himself needs expiation on his own account, but the atoning power of a person who exercises that power in his own right and who himself needs no atonement. As He exercised the divine forgiveness by standing in the room and stead of God towards us, He has also done the work of Reconciliation by placing Himself as God in our room and stead—God suffering in and on behalf of sinful flesh.

This is the work Christ came to do, and this is the work He finished on the Cross. By His sacrifice He contributed

something new and vital to the principle of Reconciliation. He gave substantive existence to a principle that was only partly and occasionally articulate fitfully glimpsed and imperfectly illustrated in outstanding individuals, revealed in symbolic manifestations, but never as the thing itself. Moreover, the principle was dying out of mind, it was being pushed out of human experience and was sinking down again into an inarticulate, elemental fact of nature. Christ rescued it from oblivion and made it to exist for the first time, not in symbolic manifestation but in substantive power, as an ascertained fact of human experience—the suffering of God enacted in terms of human passion. As we have already seen in the previous article, the vitality of Religion as we know it depends absolutely on the condition or promise, that at some time and at some point it must be confirmed as a fact in human experience—God acting and suffering as man. Except for that proleptic conviction, the strongest faith of the past would have been nothing but a helpless cry and it would never have reached us as a living voice. In Christ the promise acclaimed and insisted on by the Elemental Religion of the Old Testament was fulfilled. The Work was now finished. The proof was provided once for all that it *is* God who suffers in the person of every human life that is reconciled to Him, the innocent suffering in and for the guilty. There may be some who will demand that there must be something more specific and unique in the work of Christ. For our part we are satisfied that it was sufficiently original and unique to be worthy of the very Son of God, that being man He was also God to the Race. As we have already said, we do not want a theory which can interpret the facts and something over, but an idea of the Person of Christ that is adequately explained by the facts themselves.

It remains to be said, in this brief outline of suggestions,

that the death of Christ must occupy the decisive and central place in the Finished Work. That death was more than the final moment of a sanctifying life, it was the sacrament of the death of God. In His death Christ suffered for the Race as only God can suffer, the perfectly pure for the impure: it is suffering in Heaven—"And I, if I be lifted up from the earth." From opposite standpoints but through the same eternal Spirit, Father and Son offered a common sacrifice. In reconciling men to Himself, God died to His own life. Death has a moral significance for us all. It means estrangement from life, from the Living One, the most drastic and final, outward effect of what sin means. How much more must death have meant to the eternal Christ, who realised the infamy, shame and dishonour of sin as only the perfectly pure can know it. He was made to be Sin for us, not as it were in a figure of speech but in reality. His pure soul was inoculated with the virus, He felt Himself in the gripe of a foreign fell disease. Like a dead body tied to the living, the dark shadow of Sin and Death dwelt in His stainless soul. He was made to feel as they feel, who are judged, sentenced, condemned. He knew it was to be forsaken of goodness, peace and honour, to become a thing accursed, to be destitute of God. He was made to be a curse for us that we might be made the righteousness of God in Him. Henceforth a new and living way of Reconciliation was opened to all mankind. It is finished! The morning stars sang together and shouted aloud for joy: It is finished! The whole creation, groaning and travailing in pain together, uttered its voice: It is finished! The angels and the saints in glory cried: It is finished! Let all men and women, crushed by Sin, cry with a loud voice: It is finished! Glory be unto His Name.

R. A. C. Macmillan.

SHALL WE COMMEMORATE OUR DEAD BY VISIBLE MONUMENTS?

George Macdonald's Negative Answer Criticised.

The writer has in his possession, the manuscripts and correspondence of the late Professor James MacGregor, D.D., who filled, thirty years ago, the chair of Systematic Theology in the New College, Edinburgh. Dr. MacGregor, for the sake of the health of his family, had to leave Scotland, and under the more kindly sky of New Zealand finished his life's work. In looking over the collection of letters that has come to me I found a number from distinguished theologians such as Candlish, Horatius Bonar, Rainy, Dods, A. B. Bruce and others, and among them was a curious letter from the late George Macdonald, novelist and poet. In New Zealand the memory of George Macdonald is passing: in the public library of our leading city there is only one of his books. In the old land his works are much more in evidence, for the London *Times* Book Club has twenty-five of his volumes in its catalogue. The letter in the writer's possession was occasioned by the death of an uncle of Macdonald in Edinburgh. The late Dr. MacGregor had interested himself in Macdonald's uncle and had taken a pious interest in his funeral, and as the man had left no property he wrote to Macdonald an appeal for monetary help to enable the Edinburgh friends to erect a memorial stone over the grave of the deceased. This appeal evoked from Macdonald the following eccentric reply:—

Covange, Boscombe, Bournemouth,
November 3, 1877.

My dear Sir,—

I hope you will not think me either a screw, or one devoid of natural affection; but the fact is I never had any margin of income,

and, although, if I were interested in your desire, something would yet be forthcoming, I cannot bring myself to send any contribution where I am more than indifferent. My dear uncle is gone to his own, and I hope to join him before long. That he should be remembered down here is, to me, no more desirable than that I should be myself remembered, while the futility of monuments turns them into a mockery. Why should we care where a man leaves his old clothes ; so that they be decently destroyed—that is all.

I hope you will not be shocked by my openness. In a word, don't believe in death at all, and would not pay him the homage of a tombstone. One day or other, sooner or later, our bones, except they make haste back to their dust, will lie about the grave's mouth or be carted away to make room for the living and their plans, and then it is better they should be but bones, not labelled as of this or that man. Thank God we shall never miss them.

Yours, my dear sir, very truly,

GEORGE MACDONALD.

Rev James MacGregor.

There is a breezy frankness about this letter that was characteristic of the writer, and its audacity of statement makes it interesting. When Charles Dickens died in 1870 the world became aware that in his will he had asked his friends not to make him the subject of monument or memorial ; but the sentiment of the nation disregarded his wish, and he was buried in Westminster Abbey, and he forms one of the great company of Britain's mighty dead whose lives are held in remembrance. The views expressed by George Macdonald cut right across the customs of the human race in our age and in every other age. It could not have been lack of means that induced him to refuse the slight assistance asked for. In 1877 he was in receipt of a civil pension and his books and lectures must have brought him a fair income. The letter must be taken as an honest expression of the writer's views, and it furnishes an admirable text for raising the question : Should the memory of the dead be perpetuated by visible monuments ? The following notes are made by way of criticism of Mac-

donald and as helping towards an answer to the question raised by the letter.

I.

Mr. Macdonald was a free lance in theology and we need not be surprised to find views about human personality, not commonly held by Christian teachers, set forth in the above letter! It would be interesting to know if Macdonald gave directions that no visible monument should mark his grave and perpetuate his memory. The body, to the Macdonald of the above letter, was simply the clothes of the Ego and a dead body was nothing more than "old clothes." But such a representation is contradicted by distinguished Christian teachers. Newman, for example, finds in the bodies of the dead, not "old clothes" but "heavenly shrines." He writes :—

> "The Fathers are in dust, yet live to God,
> So says the Truth; as if the motionless clay
> Still held the seeds of life beneath the sod,
> Smouldering and struggling till the judgment-day.
> Sophist may urge his cunning test, and deem
> That they are earth; but they are heavenly shrines."

Such are the views of a representative Roman Catholic. The Protestant view is set forth by the late Professor Laidlaw, D.D., of the New College, Edinburgh, in his "Cunningham Lecture"—"The Bible Doctrine of Man." He writes, "In the Scriptural account of man's origin there is no degradation of the earthly frame in favour of the soul, as if the latter were the man and the former were only the prison-house into which he was sent, or the husk in which he was for a time concealed"; and he quotes with approval the following words of another theologian :— "According to Scripture, the body is neither the slave of the soul nor the prison-house, as philosophy with its dualistic views of body and mind has constantly taught. The rela-

tion of the two may be described as sacramental ; the body is the outward and visible sign of inward and spiritual mind." Newman and Laidlaw agree that human personality is not complete without the body and they hold that this is true here and hereafter. This view Macdonald holds up to scorn. A fabled story that comes from the Persian about the sainted Abdallah sets forth his belief. The dead Abdallah speaks thus :

> "Sweet friends, what the women lave
> For the last sleep of the grave
> Is the hut which I quitting,
> Is a garment no more fitting,
> Is a cage from which at last
> Like a bird my soul has passed."

In life after death then to Macdonald the soul is everything in human personality and the body nothing. In some of the pre-Christian religions such as the Egyptian the body was everything and the destruction of the dead body meant the destruction of personality. The Egyptian doctrine of a future life led to preservation of body by embalming, so that personality might be perpetuated. Macdonald's view is directly antagonistic to this.

II.

Mr. Macdonald's humanity is as eccentric as his Christian divinity. He writes : "In a word, I don't believe in death at all and would not pay him the homage of a tombstone." He thus flouts one of the most ancient and most widespread sentiments of the human race. There is no custom more ancient than that of perpetuating the memory of the dead by tombstones or by an equivalent. The burial mound was the common form of visible monument in very early times. In Homer we read that over the remains of Hector and Achilles were raised "barrows" or mounds of great magnitude. In every country in Europe there is

evidence of the custom in early times of thus remembering the dead and the same evidence is seen in Asia Minor, India, China and Japan. The Pyramids of Egypt are simply developments from these prehistoric burial mounds. In prehistoric times the memorials of the dead took the form also of erections of stone. These rude erections have stood the destructive forces of nature and of man and exist still in thousands in many countries. The menhirs, alignments, cromlechs, dolmens, which date from a far back past age were the forerunners of the obelisks, statues and other monuments of our modern civilisation. The sentiment to perpetuate the memory of the dead seems to have grown stronger as civilisation advanced. To-day the practice is universal. The cemeteries of our great cities teem with memorial stones, and when this Great world war is over this sentiment that George Macdonald refuses to recognise will show itself stronger than ever and our soldier dead will be commemorated throughout our Empire by visible monuments.

III.

Mr. Macdonald writes: "My dear uncle is gone to his own and I hope to join him before long. That he should be remembered down here is to me no more desirable than that I should be remembered." The history of the past would be very much poorer if such sentiments had influenced the human race from the beginning. The only record we have of peoples who lived thousands of years ago is to be found in their graves, with their memorials. The exploration of these has made us acquainted with the arts, institutions, customs and religious opinions of races long vanished from the earth. The history of the Greeks, Romans, Babylonians, Persians and Egyptians has been in a sense dug out of graves. The sentiment Mr. Macdonald

flouts has found expression in the literature of the world. The elegy and the epitaph in song, if not in stone, commemorate the dead, and they seem to be inspired by the belief that there is a sacramental relationship between the dead and their dust. This feeling runs through poems like Gray's "Elegy in a Country Churchyard," in which he says:

> "E'en from the tomb the voice of Nature cries,
> E'en in our ashes live their wonted fires."

Longfellow is influenced by the same sentiment, for he writes:

> "I like that Saxon phrase which calls
> The burial ground God's acre! It is just;
> It consecrates each grave within its walls
> And breathes a benison o'er the sleeping dust."

Mr. Macdonald's views would rule out the elegy and the epitaph from our literature as well as banish monuments from our cemeteries. The epitaph is a thing of the present as well as of the past, though in the past it bulked larger than in our time. The Greeks that fell at Thermopylae had inscribed over them:

> "Go tell the Spartans, those thou passest by,
> That here obedient to their law we lie."

The idea of sanctity of the sepulchre was widespread among the Romans and it has gripped the mind of our British ancestors. Over the grave of Shakespeare at Stratford on Avon are the following words that came from his pen:

> "Good friend, for Jesus' sake forbeare
> To dig the dust enclosed heare;
> Blest be ye man yt spares thes stones
> And curst be he yt moves my bones."

The epitaph fills a fairly important place in English literature. Dr. Johnson made it the subject of a treatise and the duty of remembering the dead was to him part of

his religion. Boswell tells us that "Johnson's affection for his departed relations seemed to grow warmest as he approached nearer to the time when he might hope to see them again. It probably appeared to him that he should upbraid himself with unkind inattention were he to leave the world without having paid a tribute of respect to their memory." On the year in which he died he got a stone erected over his parents' graves and wrote an epitaph which was duly inscribed thereon. A sample of the sentiment of Johnson expressed in song may be given by quoting his memorial lines on Philips, a friend and physician :

> "Philips, whose touch harmonious could remove
> The pangs of guilty power or hapless love :
> Rest here, distressed by poverty no more,
> Here find that calm thou gav'st so oft before ;
> Sleep undisturbed within this peaceful shrine,
> Till angels wake thee with a note like thine ! "

The epitaph has come down to our time purged from the buffoonery and humour that ofttimes disfigured it. Its words are fewer and its reverence is deeper. Tennyson used his genius in perpetuating the memory of the dead in the greatest poem of the nineteenth century. The epitaph also was not beneath his mission. What could be finer than his lines on Sir John Franklin ?

> "Not here ! the white north has thy bones ; and thou,
> Heroic sailor-soul,
> Art passing on thine happier voyage now
> Towards no earthly pole."

And what could be finer than his words on General Gordon :

> "Warrior of God, man's friend, and tyrant's foe,
> Now somewhere dead far in the waste Soudan,
> Thou livest in all hearts ; for all men know
> This earth has never borne a nobler man."

IV.

The writer in re-reading the literature on the life of Thomas Carlyle learned how powerfully the old sage was

impressed by the sentiment of reverence for the dead flouted by Mr. Macdonald. The din of controversy has ceased with regard to the alleged hardness and harshness of Thomas Carlyle. The world of letters now knows that there was a great depth of affection in him. A leading London newspaper in reviewing Carlyle's letters to his sister headed the article "Carlyle the Tender." This tenderness is seen in his memory of his wife and in his pathetic interest in her grave. Here is the epitaph he wrote for her tombstone:

"Here rests Jane Welsh Carlyle, spouse of Thomas Carlyle, Chelsea, London. . . . In her bright existence she had more sorrows than are common; but also a soft invincibility, a clearness of discernment and a noble loyalty of heart which are rare. For forty years she was the true and ever loving helpmate of her husband, and by act and word unweariedly forwarded him as none else could, in all of worthy that he attempted. She died at London 21 April, 1866, suddenly snatched away from him and the light of his life is as gone out."

But the witness-bearing of Carlyle does not stop here. To Haddington Churchyard where his wife's body was laid Carlyle made periodic visits up to the last. Mr. Hector Macpherson in his *Thomas Carlyle* gives the story of those visits as told by the gravedigger. In the literature of sorrow there are few pictures more touching than the following:

"'Ay,' said the grave keeper, 'he comes here lonesome and alone when he visits his wife's grave. His niece keeps him company to the gate, but he leaves her there and she stays there for him. The last time he was here I got a sight of him, and he was bowed under his white hairs and he took his way up by that ruined wall of the old Cathedral, and round there and in here by the gateway, and he tottered up here to this spot. And he stood here awhile in the grass, and then he kneeled down and stayed on his knees at the grave; then he bent over and I saw him kiss the ground—aye he kissed it again and again, and he kept kneeling, and

it was a long time before he rose and tottered out of the Cathedral and wandered through the graveyard to the gate where his niece was waiting for him.' "

It follows from the foregoing that an answer must be given in the affirmative to the question, Should we perpetuate the memory of the dead by visible memorials? The social pressure of custom is nigh universal in its favour and this sentiment has the force of an instinct. A period may be put to these notes by citing the testimony of *Amiel's Journal*. Under date August 7, 1874, we read: "I passed the morning in the churchyard; the 'Oasis' was delightful. . . . A little conjunction of things struck me. Two ladies were tending and watering a grave; two nurses were suckling their children. This double protest against death had something touching and poetical in it. 'Sleep, you are dead; we, the living, are thinking of you, or at least carrying on the pilgrimage of the race"; and at an earlier date he wrote, after visiting a churchyard where the dead seemed dishonoured, "I was struck with something wanting in our national feeling—respect for the dead, the poetry of the tomb, the piety of memory."

Robert Wood Wellington.

PAUL NOT A SACRAMENTARIAN.

In the very able article of Professor H. T. Andrews in the November Expositor on "The Place of the Sacraments in the Teaching of St. Paul," the learned writer, it seems to me, makes the fatal mistake of reading into Paul's language about baptism the ideas of the Mithraists and of the later sacramentarian Christians. This is precisely the vice of the historico-critical method that Professor H. A. A. Kennedy has so skilfully refuted in his *St. Paul and the Mystery-Religions*. Paul's keen mind was all alert for points of contact with the thought of his time, but he was not a mere blunderer with no coherent theology. Professor Andrews surely overstates the matter when he claims that scientific exegesis has given the victory to the sacramentarians against the symbolists and that theologians must find some way to rescue modern Christianity from this blight or throw Paul overboard as a reliable interpreter of Christianity. He holds rightly that modern Christians as a whole are not going to accept sacramentarian Christianity. Professor Andrews admits that Paul has his evangelical side, but that the inconsistency in his attitude toward baptism is incapable of solution. I venture to reply that Professor Andrews has himself gotten into the fog instead of Paul.

If one interprets Paul's language about baptism symbolically there is no inconsistency. The bugle blast of liberty in Galatians against the Judaising ceremonialists is thus entirely in place when we come to Paul's teaching on baptism. Now there are two passages in Paul's epistles that to my mind are decisive on this point and render it impossible to class Paul with the sacramentarians on the subject of baptism. The first one is 1 Corinthians i. 14–17. Here Paul expresses gratitude (εὐχαριστῶ) that he baptized none

of the Corinthian Christians save Crispus and Gaius. Then he recalls the household of Stephanas and beyond that cannot recall whether he baptized any others. Certainly this attitude almost of indifference, is not that of a man who attached saving efficacy to the ordinance of baptism. But verse 17 settles the matter. "For Christ sent me not to baptize (βαπτίζειν), but to evangelise (εὐαγγελίζεσθαι), not in wisdom of speech, that the cross of Christ should not be made empty." Here Paul deliberately interprets his permanent mission as an apostle (ἀπέστειλεν) of Christ in language that leaves baptism to one side, and in contrast with his real work of preaching the gospel. I do not see how it is possible to understand that Paul could write thus if he held to baptismal regeneration. Certainly Paul is not making light of baptism, but he did not consider it his task.

I do not press the last clause, where the fear is implied that the cross of Christ may be rendered null and void, emptied (κενωθῇ) of real value. It is possible to confine this clause to the "wisdom of speech," though it naturally points back also to the previous contrast. The other passage is Romans vi. 3–6, where Paul explains the symbolism of baptism in terms of burial and resurrection. Certainly here Paul is a symbolist, as is so beautifully brought out by Sanday and Headlam on this passage. There are passages in Paul's writings which are capable of the sacramentarian interpretation given to them by Professor Andrews. My contention is that these ambiguous passages should be expounded in the light of Paul's real spirit and not from the standpoint of Mithraism and later sacramentarian Christianity. To do that is not in my opinion scientific exegesis. It the rather makes a jumble of Paul, whose insight into the mind of Christ has never been surpassed. It is not yet necessary to throw Paul overboard.

A. T. Robertson.

LUCAN TRIPLICATIONS.

St. Luke frequently employs triplications in order to emphasise his meaning or to enforce spiritual truths. The three parables of the lost sheep, the lost piece of money, and the lost or prodigal son in the fifteenth chapter of his Gospel occur to us, at once, as examples of this habit.

St. Matthew (xviii. 12, 13) conveys the same truth in his narrative of only one of these parables, that of the lost sheep, but Luke obtains greater emphasis by recording all three.

Not only, however, does Luke narrate all the three, but he is also careful to record a beautiful minor triplication which our Lord employed to indicate emphatically the prodigal son, when He alluded to him in the parable as "this My son," "this Thy son," "this thy brother" (Luke xv. 24, 30, 32). He thus very forcibly pointed out the individual lost sinner, whom He came "to seek and to save" (Luke xix. 10). The prodigal is singled out in each of these expressions by the use of the word "this," in Greek αὗτος (autos).

If we turn to the book of Acts written by the same author (Luke i. 3; Acts i. 3), we may expect to find similar literary arrangements; it also contains triplications in order to give emphasis; the first one, at the beginning fittingly points with force to the One proclaimed in the pages of the book—to the Lord Jesus Christ; again the word αὗτος is the connecting link between the components. Luke records in the Acts that our Lord is three times described as αὗτος ὁ Ἰησοῦς (the accusative case being employed in the last two passages); this is a phrase which does not occur again in the book. At the Ascension the Apostles were told, "This Jesus . . . shall so come in like manner as ye beheld Him

going into heaven " (i. 11) ; on the day of Pentecost Peter said to the Jews, " This Jesus did God raise up, whereof we all are witnesses " (ii. 32), and on the same occasion he also said, " Let all the house of Israel therefore know assuredly, that God hath made Him both Lord and Christ, this Jesus, whom ye crucified " (ii. 36).

In the Revised Version, from which these quotations have been made, uniformity of translation has been maintained by the use of the term " This Jesus " in each case, and the triplication is observable in it, as well as in the original Greek.

But the existence of this beautiful triplication is not apparent to those who only read the Authorised English Version, because uniformity of translation has not been observed in it, the same Greek expression being differently translated each time ; thus in the first passage it is rendered " This same Jesus " (i. 11), in the second it is " This Jesus " (ii. 32), while in the last it is " That same Jesus " (ii. 36).

This triplication in the Acts, however, most certainly exists. Surely the use of the very same word *αὗτος* to designate the individual sinner, lost and saved, in the Gospel of Luke, and the seeking Saviour in the triplication in the Acts, indicates a most gracious purpose. It serves to connect the two in an intimate manner, somewhat parallel to the method of the Apostle Paul, when he wrote in the same personal strain of " the Son of God, who loved me, and gave Himself up for me " (Gal. ii. 20).

G. Mackinlay.

THE TALMUD AND THE DATE OF THE CRUCIFIXION.

In the *Anglo-Jewish Calendar for Every Day in the Gospels*, published several years ago, I printed in full, in terms of the Jewish and English Calendars, about 739 days, which I allotted to the public ministry of our Lord, beginning with the first Passover (John ii. 23), Tuesday, April 15, A.D. 29, and ending with Good Friday, April 27, A.D. 31.

Some critics supposed that this final Passover, or indeed any Passover, falling in the last week of April was impossibly late, but they were mistaken. As recently as 1910, the Passover fell on April 24–25, and according to Anger (*De Temp. in Act. App. Ratione*, p. 41), there was a Passover on April 29–30. Of this German scholar, who is hardly known in this country, I make bold to say that in his knowledge of the Jewish Calendar he has no rival. On the one point of the date of the death of St. James, protomartyr of the Apostles, his researches are worthy of a place beside the famous *Mémoire* of M. Waddington on the date of the martyrdom of St. Polycarp.

My difficulty in the construction of the Anglo-Jewish Tables for the life of our Lord was immeasurably increased by the necessity of tracing the operation of the all-important factor known to students as the "Rule Badhu." Three things at least are certain about this anti-lunar and most ingenious device. (1) It is *the* secret of the Jewish Calendar and has never been openly avowed by the Jewish framers of the Tables; (2) This elusive entity is distinctly visible to the skilled observer, but to no one else; (3) The main object which it infallibly attains is to keep the Passover off the Friday and to force it to fall on the Saturday or Sabbath.

In my Tables I have followed the working of this strange mathematical leaven through 164 days of the life of Christ. It is seen in full though furtive operation in A.D. 31, the year of the Crucifixion as given in this long and detailed reckoning. That year, according to all the rules of a lunar or semi-lunar Calendar, with an intercalated *Veadar*, the Passover was bound to fall on a Friday. It slipped its moorings and fell on a Saturday. Our Lord kept the true calendary Passover on the Friday ; the Jews kept their *Badhu*-regulated Passover on the day after. (Cf. John xviii. 28.) Thus Jesus and the masses followed two " styles " as distinct from one another as the Gregorian from the Russian.

The conclusion was met by the formidable retort that my theory of the Transference of the Passover had no weight of authority behind it. Not only this, but it was confidently asserted that the Talmud explicitly allowed the conjunction of Friday and Passover.

Glancing at the reference given to the Talmudic tractate, *Pesachim,* I found, as I thought, a weak point in my armour. Never wavering in my conviction that *Badhu* was " in being " in the time of Christ, I felt, I confess, somewhat disconcerted by the reflection that the Talmud could be quoted against me, even though, as a compilation, it had had its origin in post-Christian days.

On fuller study of the text which was supposed to weaken, if not to destroy, my hypothesis of the non-legal severance of the Friday and the Passover, I made the discovery that the Talmud, far from being opposed to me, was emphatically in my favour.

I append the Latin translation by Blasius Ugolinus.

Si Pascha exierit aut pollutum fuerit, comburatur statim. Si domini polluti fuerint aut mortui fuerint, mutetur ejus forma et comburatur decimo sexto die. . . . Ossa, nervi et reliquiæ comburuntur decimo sexto die. *Si decimus sextus dies inciderit in Sabbatum,* comburent decimo septimo.

(*Gemara Hieros. Tract. de Pascha*, vii. 7 : Ugolinus, *Thes. Antiq. Sacr.*, tom. xvii. p. DCCCL. Venice, 1755).

The third word here, *exierit*, makes nonsense, and should be replaced by *oberraverit*. The Hebrew root used is שָׁנָה, which means *oberravit* or *aberravit*. The Passover in question has clearly "strayed" from its position. Beginning as it did on the evening of the 14th Nisan, its legal place is, of course, on the 15th. On this point the Bible is most explicit, but not more explicit than in the instructions about the disposal of the *reliquiæ* of the lamb. These were to be burnt with fire on the early morning of the 15th Nisan (Exod. xii. 10). Now the *Gemara* above quoted makes it clear that *in event of the "Aberration" of the Passover*, the eating of the sacrificial meal began on the evening of the 15th Nisan, and that the destruction by fire of the remains of the lamb took place on the morning of the 16th. On the face of it, this is a most deliberate departure from the letter of the Bible—I do not say from its spirit. What may be considered a justification of this action I have given elsewhere. The fact, however, remains. The Passover could be, and was, shifted at times from Friday, 15th Nisan, to Saturday, 16th Nisan. Acting on this drastic reform, sanctioned by the Rabbis, the Jews were now confronted with a difficulty touching the observance of the Sabbath. The burning of bones was strictly prohibited on that thrice holy day. The meal of the shifted Passover being over on the midnight of Friday, 15th Nisan, what were they to do with the bones and sinews, when in the small hours of Saturday, 16th Nisan, they found themselves well within the sacred limits of the Sabbath ? Talmudic casuistry was equal to the occasion. The *Gemara* (*supra*) orders the burning to be deferred till the Sabbath is over, and the Sunday, covering the 17th Nisan, has begun.

A closer parallel to the conditions prevailing at the Pass-

over of A.D. 31 can hardly be imagined. That year there was undoubtedly a case of "Aberration," and it is the *only* year towards the close of the ministry of our Lord, when that phenomenon could possibly have occurred. Originally, I never thought of invoking the Talmud to add its evidence to the many reasons which determined my choice of A.D. 31 as the year of the Crucifixion. Now I do invoke it, and in the strength of this new alliance, which was once deemed a strong opposition, I may be pardoned for feeling more confident than ever in the accuracy of my final conclusion.

MATTHEW A. POWER.

THE MORAL VALUE OF PARABOLIC TEACHING.

"WHY speakest Thou unto them in parables?" The question betrays the surprise and perplexity which the disciples felt when Jesus, desisting from further attempts to impart religious knowledge by plain statement, adopted the parabolic form of teaching. That He began His ministry by instructing the people directly, and resorted to the use of parable only as a second course, is a fact important to notice, if a right understanding of the Master's use of parable is to be gained. That His use of parable was a new method of instruction is certainly implied in this question of the disciples. The change is sufficiently accounted for by the unreceptiveness which He found in many of His hearers, and by the smouldering hostility towards Him evinced by the Scribes. Jesus began this second course only after an experience of various classes of hearers; an experience sufficiently extensive to show the futility of teaching plainly and openly. Then it was He began "to use similitudes."

The words in which Jesus answered the disciple's question give as great perplexity to men of "the modern mind" as His parabolic method caused the disciples. All three synoptists record the answer; Mark in this form: "And He said unto them, Unto you is given the mystery of the kingdom of God: but unto them that are without, all things are done in parables: that seeing, they may see and not perceive; and hearing, they may hear and not understand; lest haply they should turn again, and it should be forgiven them" (Mark iv. 11, 12 = Matt. xiii. 13 = Luke viii. 10). In none of the accounts is there any sign of disturbance in the text. In Matthew the words are

given as the *reason* for teaching by parables—"*because* seeing they see not"; whereas Mark gives them as stating the *purpose*—"*that* seeing, they may see and not perceive." As the reason and the purpose are but two aspects of a thing, the variation need not detain us. The crux of the matter could hardly be better stated than by Dr. A. B. Bruce. "A more serious difficulty arises in connexion with Christ's answer to their question, which seems to say that He adopted the parabolic method in order to hide the truths of the kingdom from unspiritual minds. Nothing is more certain than that Jesus neither did nor could adopt any such policy; and if the evangelists ascribe it to Him, then we should have no alternative but to agree with those who, like Holtzmann (H. C.) and Jülicher . . . maintain that the evangelists have mistaken His meaning, reading *intention* in the light of *result*. It is much better to impute a mistake to them than an inhuman purpose to Christ." [1]

Professor W. J. Moulton thinks: [2] "We have to do in this passage with a saying of Jesus that, in the course of time, has been modified, or received a false emphasis." On the same lines Professor George Jackson writes: [3] "Many explanations of the difficulty have been offered, but on the whole none so likely as that the reporters of Jesus misunderstood Him. And if there be no other way out, we shall agree with Dr. Bruce" (as above).

"If there be no other way out!" But is there no other way out? Until they are tolerably certain that no interpretation of Jesus' words, as reported by Mark, is to be found less violent than this, many will still refuse to acquiesce in it. It may be noted that no trace of the words being

[1] *Expos. Greek Test*, vol. i. p. 196a.
[2] *Dict. Christ and Gospels*, vol. ii. p. 315.
[3] *The Preacher and the Modern Mind*, p. 106.

"modified in the course of time" is found in the text, the versions, or the writers of the early Church. This is a pure guess made to avoid crediting Christ with a supposedly inhuman purpose. And to assert that Jesus neither did nor could adopt the parabolic method "in order to hide the truths of the kingdom from unspiritual minds" is as gratuitous an assertion as any of those commonly repudiated as "orthodox." The assertion "takes away the key of knowledge," and forecloses inquiry into the moral value of the parabolic method. To the statement that the disciple's error arose "from reading *intention* in the light of *result*," Alford's answer is pertinent: "when God transacts a matter it is idle to say the result is not the purpose."

Assuming now that the words as narrated by Mark are genuine words of Jesus, and that they give His explanation of the purpose for which He used parables, it is to be noticed that they set before us two classes of hearers—"You" and "Them that are without." The former, "They that were about Him with the Twelve," are those who comprised a higher form of disciples in the Master's school. Whether the latter were "unspiritual minds" is open to question. Dr. Swete thinks: "The words must not be understood as a reproach; they merely state a fact. . . . To such, while they remained outside, the mystery was not committed in our Lord's lifetime; nevertheless they received what they could."[1] Jesus found, and pointed out to the Twelve and some others, that those who were friendly to Him, those who "see and hear," were not all alike in the receptiveness of His teaching, but belong to two classes. On the one hand stand those who both see and perceive, both hear and understand, the mystery of the kingdom; and on the other hand, those who see and do not perceive, hear and do not understand. They formed a class which stood

[1] Comm. on Mark *in loco*.

midway between the hostile Scribes on the one side, and, on the other, the percipient disciples. Those who formed this class were to be tested, and, if they responded, were to have their perceptive powers exercised and developed by the parabolic teaching. Not yet enfranchised as citizens of the kingdom, they were to be tested for enfranchisement. It is plain that they had not "turned again," and that "it had not yet been forgiven them." If they believed in Jesus, they had not yet avowed their faith; so that Jesus, if He had already forgiven them, had not yet announced their forgiveness to them. They might be said to be "unspiritual minds" in the sense that they had not yet perceived the truth, but not in that they had perceived and disobeyed the truth. They were not judicially blinded, but spiritually impercipient. The question of their position in the final judgement does not come into the field of view. The presence of this class in the Christian religion is commonly overlooked, and sometimes denied. But once brought under notice every Christian pastor is able to verify it in the congregation. The many are content to hear, the few go on to understand. The many are Christians by impression, the few by conviction. Some may be mentally incapable of understanding; some may be precluded by lack of early education, or because they have unfortunately inherited an obscurantist tradition; and some may be unable to understand on account of their immoral unwillingness to make the required effort, or to pay the proper cost.

I.

Jesus' parables, then, are designed to operate a moral test. It has come to be popularly supposed that Jesus taught in parables to make the truth of the Christian religion plain. His own statement, however, is to the effect that He used parables to keep the truth secret. The mystery

of the kingdom, shown to those who are fitted to receive it, remains hidden from those who are yet unfitted. Jesus taught in parables because they effect this twofold purpose of revealing the truth to some, and concealing it from others. A parable is a beautiful veil thrown over the truths of the Christian religion, not to disguise their form, but to screen them from the gaze of such as, not yet fitted to behold them, would suffer injury by looking upon them. "A parable," wrote Bacon long ago, "tends to veil the truth and tends to illustrate the truth." The parable thus provides not a flat standard to determine whether a hearer is spiritual or unspiritual, but a progressive test to measure the spiritual receptivity of men. Truth is disclosed to individual men, not at a flat rate, but according to a sliding scale.

Jesus' method of partially revealing and partially concealing the truth in parables is consistent with the method of all revelation. There have always been some who affirm that, in the creation, in history, in providence, in conscience divine truth is revealed; and there have always been some who deny. It appears then that God has revealed so much of His mind that some men are able to understand (in part) His purposes; and, that God has made so partial a disclosure of Himself to men that others cannot understand Him. Even in the incarnate Son, God is not so clearly revealed that every man is constrained to recognise and confess Him. His human body is a veil which at once reveals and conceals the incarnate God.

Veiled in flesh the Godhead see.

It is evident then that the charge of "hiding the truths of the kingdom" might be levelled as effectively against all divine revelation as against the purpose stated in Mark iv. 12.

The parabolic method of teaching spiritual truth, with

its progressive test (and its patient appeal for the exercise) of the hearer's moral receptivity, is adapted to man's probationary condition. The truth so presented, a man who sees will perceive as clearly as he has the moral ability to perceive. George Meredith admitted that he had made some passages in his writings obscure, and when asked why the obscurity was intentional, he answered: "I did not wish directly to declare the disenrobed verities." The intellectual apprehension of religious truths is morally conditioned. Clear perception of the eternal verities depends on purity of character. And the parabolic method of instruction operates a progressive test of a man's fitness to receive spiritual things. So far from being "inhuman," this purpose is entirely congruous with the moral and religious conditions of human life.

II.

Moreover, the parabolic method, by which the understanding of the truth may be concealed from some while it is revealed to others, exhibits the Master's clemency towards His impercipient hearers. Judged by a fixed standard, like recruits tested for enlistment in the forces, most men would fail of acceptance. But when the examination is conducted by means of a progressive test, every man has a chance of acceptance, or at least of endeavouring to fit himself for acceptance. For hereditary bias, unfortunate environment, and defective training, prevent as many at least from understanding the truth they hear as does the love of the world, and the judicial blindness which it engenders. In setting before such men the truths of religion by means of parables, which reserve the understanding of the truths until a man is able to receive it, Jesus acts in human kindness and divine mercy.

By teaching in parables, which reserve the truth until a

man is able to bear it, Jesus moderates the hearer's responsibility, and thus mitigates his guilt. If a man were permitted to understand the truth he hears before he is morally fitted to receive it, the truth would not help but injure him. For it would bring upon his conscience a responsibility which he would be unable to discharge. Were a man to perceive "the mystery of the kingdom," to be entrusted with "the secret of the Lord," before he is spiritually prepared for the privilege, he would inevitably abuse it. His abusing the sacred privilege would inevitably involve him in aggravated guilt, and this he is prevented from incurring by the veiling of the truth in the parable. Hence Jesus' purpose in using parable was motived by divine grace.

Again the screening of the secret of Christian truth in parables leaves open the hearer's opportunity. In the picture he sees the truth which he does not yet perceive and understand. He may be indifferent to the concealed meaning, and content to rest in the obvious story. He sees the picture, though he cannot see into it. He looks at the parable, though unable to look through it at the truth it illustrates. Standing in the hall of a castle, where the windows are of stained glass, a man may focus his eyes on the windows, or he may look through the windows at the landscape. So with the parables, the hearer may regard but the outer aspects, as children do, or he may gain insight into its meaning, as a man should. At any rate the parable provides him with the opportunity to gain the insight. As Matthew Henry puts it: "A parable is a shell which keeps good fruit for the diligent, but keeps it from the slothful."

III.

The parabolic method of teaching, as it tests the moral worth of impercipient hearers, effects a judgement upon the slothful among them. This judgement, like the mercy

which is its necessary complement, is present and continuous in the life of every slothful hearer. His mental and moral listlessness precludes him from attaining to the understanding and certitude which belong to those who "know the mystery of the kingdom." It prevents him from enjoying the sense of religious security which attaches to "the secret of the Lord." They cannot know the peace that passeth understanding, nor be quiet from fear of evil. Not having a mind eager to welcome the truth they are taught by a method which prevents them from understanding the truth—until they shall have changed the disposition of their mind. If Jesus had not adopted some method of screening the truths of the kingdom from the minds of those who, although friendly to Him, are yet too slothful to learn to know His truth, He would have done violence to the conscience of right which He has implanted and nourished in the human breast.

The veiling of "the mystery of the kingdom" by parables effects a judgement on the slothful hearer in that his moral and spiritual perceptions, not sharpened by exercise, suffer atrophy. Although in his ignorance and moral decrepitude he may find mercy with the Saviour, "from him shall be taken away that which he hath." For lack of using his perceptive powers to gain an understanding of the truth he loses such poor and confused notions of religious truth as he may originally have had. The rays of the sun darken and pain the eye which is not strong enough to bear the light. "On those who do not perceive," says Irenæus, "God sends blindness." The obstinately impercipient will be judicially blinded. "The mystery of the kingdom" will not be given to them. The Lord does not say that they shall therefore be excluded from the kingdom.

IV.

The moral value of parabolic teaching lies in the exigent demand it makes for the moral use of the mental powers of the hearer. His fitness to be entrusted with " the mystery of the kingdom " consists in an earnest and ardent desire to know and to do whatever is enjoined in the mystery. This disposition of unqualified willingness to obey every whisper spoken in the secret counsel of truth supplies the clue to the meaning of Christ's long misunderstood words. He states that He taught in parables in order that, when the impercipient see the truth and do not perceive its meaning, when they hear the word and do not understand its secret, they should not come to the consciousness of the divine forgiveness. Then Jesus does not desire that the impercipient should gain the divine peace! Evidently not —unless they " turn again " ; unless, i.e., they turn from their complacent, superficial, listless, slothful, hearing, and become humble, earnest, docile, and obedient hearers. No man is permitted to enjoy the ineffable peace that springs from the assurance of the divine forgiveness unless he is prepared to pay for the secret with the price of obedience.

To understand " the mystery of the kingdom " the hearer must be ready to obey the King. It is this unqualified readiness to obey the Master that turns seeing into perceiving, and hearing into understanding. By parables the truth is so disclosed and so screened as to test the sincerity of the hearers to obey and to know it. That is not a mystery or secret of which nothing at all is known. It is essential to a secret that some of those who do not yet know it know that it is there to be known. And it is a quality of a secret to stimulate these to inquire into its content. This " secret of the Lord " the others of his disciples seem content not

to know. They read the story, and evince no desire to understand its meaning. They listen to the religious tale and show no wish to perceive its message.

The secret of the kingdom is entrusted to those hearers who are willing to pay the price in obedience. Every kingdom has its secrets of state and the kingdom of God is no exception. All state secrets are costly. The costly secret of the kingdom may be obtained by every man who is willing to give the price. The Master Himself taught that the secret is like treasure hid in a field, to buy which a man went away and sold all that he had; that it is like one pearl of great price, to buy which the merchant went and sold all the other goodly pearls which he had gathered. By any man the mystery is to be purchased only by the price of "all that he hath." When he has paid this price the hearer perceives that which he sees, and understands that which he hears. To effect this purpose Jesus used parables, because they screen the truth from the minds of the impercipient, while they illuminate the truth for those who perceive it.

> To those who fall how kind Thou art!
> How good to those who seek!
>
> But what to those who find? Ah this!
> Nor tongue nor pen can show.

To these "the mystery of the kingdom" is given.

J. Grange Radford.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF ST. STEPHEN IN THE HISTORY OF THE PRIMITIVE CHRISTIAN CHURCH.[1]

The story of St. Stephen and his relation to contemporary Judaism on one side and to the Christian Church on the other give rise to many questions and are not free from some difficulties, and the present paper is an attempt to answer some of these questions and to make clear the true position of St. Stephen and the movement that he initiated and their place in the history of the early Church.

I.

The Source of the Narrative and some Questions that arise from it.

We shall do well to open our inquiry with an estimate of the value of the source from which the narrative of the movement is derived. It is generally agreed that this section of the Acts, viz., chapters vi.–viii. 4, is based on information of high historical value and that with the exception of the " we "-document there is not a better authenticated narrative in the book. Harnack has a very thorough discussion of the sources of Acts in his *Acts of the Apostles*, pp. 162–247, and has formed a high opinion of the historical worth of this particular section. He regards it as belonging to a wider source, comprising not only chapters vi.–viii. 4, but also xi. 19–30, xii. 25–xv. 35, which,

[1] I am indebted for several suggestions in this paper to a valuable article by R. Pahncke in the *Studien und Kritiken*, 1912, pp. 1–38.

according to him, forms a single connected narrative, the dominant interest in which is Antioch and the opening phases of the Mission to the Gentiles. It betrays signs of intimate acquaintance on the part of the author with the history of the Church of Jerusalem as well as with the importance of Antioch as the true starting point of the Gentile Christian propaganda, and Harnack suggests that in this portion of his work St. Luke is dependent upon information supplied by Silas, who was connected with both Jerusalem and Antioch, was appointed an ambassador from the Church of Jerusalem to that of Antioch, and was a resident in the latter city for some considerable time. He is also of opinion that the source to some extent took the form of a written document. Sir W. M. Ramsay (see EXPOSITOR, vii. 7, pp. 172 ff., 262 ff.) is also as insistent as Harnack on the high historical value of the section and contends that it must have come from an eyewitness whom he identifies with Philip, to whom he attributes the information upon which the whole of chapters ii.–x. are based. It seems to me, however, that Harnack is nearer the truth in this particular matter than Ramsay and that the story of the Stephen movement has more in common with chapters xi.–xv. than with ii.–v. and viii. 4–x. Ramsay himself states that the centre of interest in the earlier chapters of the Acts is St. Peter and that the author of the original source of the narrative had an intense admiration for this Apostle, but it is significant that St. Peter's name never emerges in vi.–viii. 4, and the paragraph vii. 58*a*–viii. 1*a*, whether it existed in the original source or not, with its first introduction of the name and personality of St. Paul, shows that in the mind of St. Luke at any rate, if not in that of his informant, the movement inaugurated by Stephen was integrally connected with the Pauline and not with the Petrine development of the Church's mission. Harnack

and other scholars are of opinion that this particular passage was not found in St. Luke's source but was interpolated by the historian himself as a fitting opportunity for introducing the great personality of St. Paul into his narrative. There is some support for the suggestion in the repetition of the statement that " they stoned Stephen " in v. 59 and in the assumption that there is in the passage a conscious imitation of some of the incidents and utterances of the Passion story. The real objection on the part of these scholars to admitting that these verses formed part of St. Luke's original authority is, however, not based on the fact that it introduces St. Paul into the story but on the fact that it is taken for granted that a disciple was not yet so thoroughly permeated with the spirit of Christ or that our Lord's dying words were not familiar enough or dear enough to the heart of the Christian of that day as to enable him to pour out his soul's utterance in the hour of death in the words of the Master. There is no sound reason, apart from prejudice and preconceived notions, for assuming that this, the most beautiful and the most touching portion of the whole narrative, is any less authentic or historical than the remainder of it.

There are difficulties, however, in the narrative which we must consider. The story of the appointment of the Seven is by no means as clear as we could wish, and several interesting questions arise from it. It has been widely maintained, and especially by those who lay great value on what the Acts is supposed to tell us concerning the origin and development of the Christian Ministry, that what St. Luke is chiefly concerned with in the beginning of chapter vi., where he is evidently taking up the opening phases of a new movement in the Church, is the establishment of a new office in that Ministry. I am exceedingly doubtful whether the historian regarded the appointment of the Seven from

this point of view. It would seem more probable, from the fact that the functions of the Seven drop out of sight immediately afterwards and have no reference to the developments which followed, that he regarded their appointment as simply due to the temporary need of the moment and not as having any permanent relation to the future of the Church as a whole. The real motive of this passage is the opportunity for introducing the personalities of St. Stephen and St. Philip, both, and especially the former, of whom exercised an important influence upon the future fortunes of the Church and not that he looked upon the appointment of the Seven as a momentous event in itself or as indicating a departure of permanent significance in the history of the Church. It is indeed a moot point whether the appointment of the Seven was a new departure and whether it indicates anything more than the addition of seven Hellenists to a body of officials which was already performing functions, a share in which was now allotted to the Seven. The narrative implies that the relief of the "widows" of the Church had been taken in hand before, and if so the work must have been assigned to a definite type of official. It is hardly likely that the Apostles would have burdened themselves with service of this character, and vi. 2 indeed implies the exact opposite. The complaint which led to the selection of the Seven arose not from the fact that there were no officials in charge of the administration of the Church's charitable relief but because these officials discriminated unfairly between Hellenistic and Palestinian Christians. It is quite possible, therefore, that the Seven were only an addition to an already existing body of officials, and the fact that they were Hellenists to a man confirms the suggestion. It is unnatural to suppose that if the creation of an entirely new body of officers was indicated that they would all have been Hellenists, as

this would have meant not the removal of a grievance but simply the transference of it from one section of the Church to the other. Much is made of the fact that St. Luke gives such a precise and formulated description of the method of election and appointment of the Seven as indicating the importance he attached to the incident, but it is comprehensible that he is here only giving a special illustration of what was the general practice of the Church at the time in the matter of the appointment of its officials. It is fairly certain, I think, that St. Luke was mainly interested in the event not as a significant step in the development of the Christian Ministry, but as bringing into public notice two men who paved the way for the extension of the Gospel of Christ to the Gentile world, which was to him a matter of supreme concern. The allusion to "Nicolas, a proselyte of Antioch," as one of the Seven may, as Harnack suggests, give the clue which connects the incident with the important movement which a little later had its centre and starting point at Antioch, a city with which St. Luke himself had an intimate connexion.

A further point which has given rise to considerable discussion is the apparent immunity of the Apostles at the time of "a great persecution" in Jerusalem, but we will postpone the consideration of this question until we come to deal with the relation of Stephen and the movement he initiated to the primitive Church of Jerusalem.

II.

The Relation of St. Stephen to Contemporary Judaism.

St. Stephen is brought upon the scene abruptly and with practically no preliminary information as to his antecedents and previous history. That he was a Hellenistic Jew is implied in the narrative of the appointment of the Seven,

and this is confirmed by all that we gather concerning him during the remainder of his short-lived career. His most active opponents belonged to the Hellenistic side of Judaism, and it is not improbable that the bitterness of their hostility was due to the fact that he had been one of themselves, perhaps a member of the cosmopolitan synagogue, or of one of the two synagogues, mentioned in vi. 9, and preferably an Alexandrian. His defence all points in this direction. He quotes the Old Testament in the LXX version and is so familiar with it that he often quotes from memory with the result that his version differs from the original in many little points, as is generally the case with those who venture to quote without documentary support. Further, his whole conception of Old Testament history is strongly reminiscent of the Hellenistic method of treatment, and in his outlook upon the partriarchal narratives and in his conception of the character of Moses he shows signs of the special influence of Philo. Several points in his address, of no great intrinsic importance perhaps but significant as indicating the source of his exegesis, are derived not from the Old Testament but from Philo, as e.g. the statements that Moses "was exceeding fair" and "was instructed in all the wisdom of the Egyptians," and in the expression "the law as it was ordained by angels" he is following the tradition of the LXX (Deut. xxxiii. 2), Philo, and Josephus. A difficulty, however, arises here. Why did Stephen's preaching arouse the hostility of the Hellenistic Jews in particular? His offence is definitely formulated in vi. 13, 14. "This man ceaseth not to speak words against this holy place and the law": "for we have heard him say that Jesus of Nazareth shall destroy this place and shall change the customs which Moses delivered unto us." It has been for some considerable time an axiom of history that the Jews of the Dispersion at this period took

very slight interest in the temple-cult and that one of the most significant movements in the development of this Hellenistic Judaism was its gradual divorce from observances associated with temple-worship and the substitution of the synagogue and its more simple and spiritual service for the ritual and sacrificial system of which the temple was the centre. Bousset (*Die Religion des Judentums in N. T. Zeitalter*) again and again emphasises this significant feature in the development of Judaism of the Dispersion and ascribes to it some of the most important consequences in the future history of the Jewish Church. The Jew of the Dispersion paid his temple dues and attended the great Festivals once at least in the course of his life, but beyond this the temple and the system associated with it had very little meaning for him. It is, therefore, somewhat difficult to understand why Stephen's disparagement of the temple and the worship of which it formed the centre should have raised the Hellenistic Jews, who apparently in theory or practice did not entertain the highest opinion of one or the other, to such a pitch of fury. There must have been more in this preaching than a statement of the relative value of the temple-cult because if it had kept within this limit many of his audience would have been in entire sympathy with him. I believe that the solution of this difficulty is to be found in Stephen's defence, where he seems to maintain that the temple-worship was from its inauguration a degeneration from the spiritual worship established by Moses and as such had been a hindrance to Israel from the moment of its initiation. His Hellenistic compatriots would have agreed with him that it was not the highest form of worship, but they would have strongly contended that it was part of God's divine plan for the spiritual development of His people, and that it had nobly accomplished this purpose for many generations, but that owing to the

changed conditions of national life and more especially in view of the nation's wide dispersion throughout the world it had now to some considerable extent outlived its period of usefulness. But Stephen went much further than this, and certain statements in his address seem to imply that in his mind the temple-system never possessed any real spiritual value, that David's desire to build the temple and Solomon's realisation of that wish were in themselves declensions from the divine plan and were the cause of the nation's defection from its highest ideals and of the loss of spirituality which followed. The original cause of the mischief, however, is traced back far beyond David and Solomon, and their action is regarded by him as only the corrupt following of the action of Aaron in the wilderness in setting up the golden calf in Horeb as the object of the people's worship, which in Stephen's mind was the initial step in the movement which led Israel to abandon the spiritual ideals revealed by God through Moses. So the temple and its cult are an evil from their commencement, a manifestation of the tendency illustrated by Israel's action in the wilderness in turning away from Moses and his teaching to worship the gods of Egypt and, therefore, an apostasy from God. If this outline of Stephen's attitude towards Judaism of the past be correct there is no difficulty in understanding the wrath of the Hellenistic Jews to whom he appealed, because although the temple and its worship might have for them little significance in practice they were to them essential factors in the religious life of the nation, holy in idea and in essence, and to stigmatise them as evil in their very origin and as manifestations of spiritual apostasy was to touch every Jew in his most sensitive part and became blasphemy against Moses and the law and a crime against God.

A study of his speech as a whole seems to bear out

this view of Stephen's attitude towards Judaism both in the past and in the present. The indictment brought against him is composed of two definite charges, blasphemy and contempt of the law, and his defence is admirably framed to meet both these charges. The latter consists of two sections, the division between which is clearly marked. The first section, vii. 2–38, is in the main a well-reasoned and adequate rebuttal of the accusation of blasphemy and of contempt for Moses and the law, while the second, vii. 39–53, contains his justification of his attitude towards the religion of the day and of his teaching which had provoked such violent and uncontrollable opposition. In the earlier portion of his speech he labours to explain his absolute accord with the nation's regard and reverence for the early history of the people and all that it implied. Abraham was " his father " as theirs, called by God, the recipient of the covenant which was sealed by circumcision. Canaan was God's heritage for His people, Joseph the divinely appointed deliverer of his people in the time of need, and for Stephen the founder of Israel as a nation, for what was only the " seed " of Abraham now becomes " a people " (vii. 17). Thus he seeks to show that his outlook upon the patriarchal age and upon the purposes of God towards His chosen people is that of every pious Jew. But it is when he comes to meet the charge of contempt for Moses that he rises to the heights of his admiration and eloquence. Moses is among all the great ones of the nation's past Stephen's hero and ideal, and language almost fails him in his efforts to express his appreciation of his qualities and of the character of his mission. And further, it is in his description of Moses and of his mission and of the attitude of Israel at the time towards both that we find the real clue to his own conception of the mission of Christ and to his estimate of popular Judaism. The significant term in the

eloquent passage in which he sets forth the splendid service rendered by Moses as God's instrument is the word "prophet." "A *prophet* shall God raise up unto you from among your brethren like unto me."

It was religion in its "prophetic" aspect, of which Moses was the first representative and founder and which was afterwards the ideal of the great prophets of the Old Testament, which appealed to Stephen, and it was a religion divorced from the prophetic and spiritual ideals of Moses, which was concerned only with the materialising and deadening priestly system and temple-cult, that he saw represented in the Judaism that he despised. Far from being a blasphemer or conceiving any contempt for Moses and his teaching, Moses was his ideal of all that was highest and noblest in the past history of the nation and of its religion. The accusation of contempt for the law was equally baseless. The law he describes in language which indicates that he attributed to it the highest value as one of God's instruments in the spiritual upbringing of His people: it contained the "living oracles," living not only in the sense of permanent and enduring, but as life-giving, as the utterance of the living God. Later on he speaks of the law "as ordained by angels," a further proof of his reverence for it and of his lofty conception of it. So he successfully disposes of the charge of blasphemy as far as it related to his appreciation of the early history of the nation and of its leaders, and more especially as it concerned his estimate of Moses and the law.

In *v.* 30, with the words "to whom our fathers would not be obedient," he enters upon his justification of his attitude towards the religion of the Jew of his own day, and in the phrase quoted above lays down the principle upon which his condemnation and repudiation of contemporary Judaism is based. From the time of Moses downwards the history

of Israel's religion was a history of "disobedience" to the will of God as revealed by Moses and in the law and of a declension from a spiritual and prophetic religion to one of relative materialism and ritual observance. The process of degeneration began in the wilderness when Aaron set up the golden calf in response to the people's desire for a return to the sensuous worship of Egypt as against the worship of the Invisible, and the Ideal of whose representative, Moses, they declared "we wot not what is become of him." In words of terrible import Stephen pictures how the nation's repudiation of God was followed by God's repudiation of it, "Then God turned," and how this resulted in the nation's decline into idolatry and pagan abominations. And even in the attempt made by David and Solomon to reform the national religion and to consolidate it by the building of the temple and the creation of a centre of worship at Jerusalem Stephen only saw the acceptance of debased ideals and a serious apostasy from the religion formulated by Moses, the visible symbol of which was the tabernacle, the sign of God's presence, His habitation by His own appointment. The religious life of the nation from the time of Moses downwards is one long-continued resistance of the Holy Ghost, and in Stephen's mind the resistance of the Spirit reached its climax in the national rejection of Christ, the chosen Messiah. When he reaches this point in his address with its burning words of condemnation and its withering contempt for their religion as it had existed for centuries and as it was realised in his own day the patience of his audience becomes exhausted and his defence is brought to an abrupt and tragic close.

To sum up, Stephen's attitude towards later Judaism is essentially that of the prophets of old towards the popular religion of their day, but his condemnation and repudiation of it are intensified a thousandfold because he has witnessed

the complete development of what were only tendencies in the days of the prophets, but were now fully realised in the rejection of Jesus Christ on the part of the Jews as a whole. He is the purest representative of the old "prophetic" spirit that we meet in the New Testament, and it is in his deep and earnest appreciation of all that was most beautiful and most spiritual in the doctrine of the prophets that we find the truest explanation of his attitude towards the religion of the Jews of his own day. It was unprophetic and unspiritual, a declension from the standard of purity set up by Moses, and flat disobedience to the exalted teaching and warnings of the noblest spirits of Israel's religion, the prophets, who had followed in the line of Moses. His intense admiration for the prophetical order is evident all through the address. Moses as a prophet is the true forerunner of Christ, it is the prophets, Amos and Isaiah, that he quotes in defence of his statements, it is the persecution and murder of the prophets culminating in the rejection and murder of "the Righteous One" which crown his indictment of the national religious spirit, not only in the past but also in the present. Stephen is, in a word, the highest exponent of "prophetic" as against "priestly" religion.

III.

St. Stephen's Relation to the Primitive Christian Church.

There was no fundamental difference between Stephen's conception of Christ and that of the primitive Christian Church as a whole, but he seems to have regarded the Person and Mission of Christ from an angle that was peculiar to himself. It may be objected that we know little or nothing concerning his Christology because his address was brought to a tragic close just as he was reaching that

part of it which bore reference to Christ and his own Christian faith. It is true that the name and Person of Christ are confined to the very last verses of his defence and to the beautiful prayers uttered at the moment of death, but a careful study of the address as a whole shows that underlying it all through is the thought of Christ, of His Mission, and of the tragedy of His rejection. This is particularly noticeable in his choice of Old Testament types, and especially of Joseph and Moses. The choice of Joseph was dictated by the fact that he was destined, after experiencing rejection and bondage, to become the salvation of his people, a sure indication of Stephen's faith in the redeeming power of Christ. But his conception of Christ and of His work is most vividly represented in his portrait of Moses. Moses was instructed in wisdom and mighty in words and deeds. He was not understood, was thrust away and denied, and yet he who had been rejected is made by God a ruler and deliverer. His appointment was confirmed by signs and wonders. He was a "prophet who was in the Church," one in full sympathy with men and their representative, the mediator between God and His people and the dispenser of "living oracles," and finally a "prophet" whose life-giving words were neither accepted nor obeyed. We cannot fail to recognise in this portrait of Moses a wonderfully accurate and sympathetic conception of Christ in the main features of His Person and activity.

The description of Christ as "the Righteous One" is in line with St. Peter's address in Acts iii. 14, "Ye denied the Holy and Righteous One," and also with the language of prophecy, in itself a testimony to the impression of absolute sinlessness and holiness of life left by Christ upon His contemporaries. The closing scene gives the finishing touches to Stephen's conception of the Redeemer. Jesus Christ, the Son of Man, is now exalted to the right hand of

God and is "standing" to express His tenderest sympathy with His suffering servant and waiting to receive him. It is to Him that he commends his departing spirit and it is of Him that he prays for forgiveness for his murderers. The two prayers addressed by Christ on the Cross to the Father are now directed by Stephen to Christ Himself as Lord. In all this there was nothing to differentiate the faith of Stephen from that of the primitive Church as a whole and yet running all through the address there is a latent thought of Christ and of His Mission which is peculiar to Stephen and is intimately related to his general attitude towards Judaism. As he conceived the Judaism of the past and present to have been an apostasy from God's will and purpose revealed by Moses and a conscious disobedience of the "living oracles" dispensed through Moses, so he had come to regard Christ as primarily the restorer of the pure Mosaic religion and the bearer of "living oracles" which were to displace and destroy the deadening and dead materialism of the temple worship of his day. In short, his main conception of Christ was as the "Prophet" whose work and mission had been forecast in the person and activity of Moses, and whose spirit had been kept alive by the line of the great prophets of the Old Testament. That the realisation of the Mission meant the displacement, condemnation, and destruction of all that was dear to the heart of the Jew was inherent in his view of the character of later Judaism.

Again, Acts viii. 1 seems to imply that Stephen and those who followed his lead were not in entire sympathy with the Church of Jerusalem as represented by the Apostles. Here the account of the great persecution of the Church of Jerusalem closes with the statement that "they were all scattered abroad . . . except the Apostles," which at first sight is difficult to explain. One would naturally have expected that anything like a general persecution of

the Church of Jerusalem would have involved the Apostles first of all, and yet according to St. Luke's narrative it would appear that the leaders alone were immune. The only conclusion that we can draw is that the persecution was not so general as seems to be implied and that it affected only a section, and that a particular section, of the Christians resident in Jerusalem. The persecution was evidently closely connected with the death of Stephen, and indeed the direct consequence of that act of violence, and it is only natural to suppose that if it was sectional and only directed against a definite class of Christian it would involve those who were most intimately associated with Stephen himself. If this was the case the persecution did not arise out of hostility to the Christian Church as such but to the particular type of Christianity represented and preached by Stephen and his followers with its definitely disparaging view of contemporary Judaism. The immunity of the Apostles was, therefore, due to the fact that they were not regarded as sympathising with Stephen's attitude towards the religion of the day, and in consequence escaped the bitter hostility displayed towards his more immediate followers. A further reason perhaps why the Apostles were not attacked was that the persecution was mainly the work of Hellenistic Jews in Jerusalem who were naturally not so interested in the doings of the Apostles who were Palestinian Jews as in those of the Stephen party, mainly composed of Hellenists like themselves. It is also not improbable that there was a cleavage between Stephen and the Apostolic party from the very commencement of his activity. There is a significant phrase in the description of his method of working in vi. 6, "he wrought great signs and wonders *among the people*," which may explain this lack of mutual sympathy. The Apostles seem to have confined their ministry mainly to private houses and the

precincts of the temple. Stephen, familiar with the methods of the peripatetic philosophers of the Hellenistic world, and especially the Cynics, descended into the public arena and conducted his propaganda in the open spaces and popular resorts of the city and thus attracted the notice of the crowd and soon drew upon himself the hostility of his audience by his revolutionary teaching. The Apostles may have considered his method of working indiscreet and they would certainly regard his attacks upon Judaism wrong-headed and extreme. To them the temple and its worship were still objects of reverence and affection, Judaism with all its imperfections was divine in its origin and development, the law, not simply in its moral aspect as put forth by Moses but in all the fulness of its detailed ordinances, demanded obedience, and Christ had come to fulfil and not to destroy. It is not surprising, therefore, that when the storm broke it was Stephen and his followers who had to bear the brunt of it and that the Apostles who had hitherto in their outward demeanour conducted themselves as pious Jews remained immune for the time.

One further point remains to be discussed, viz., Stephen's relation to St. Paul. The trend of the narrative and the definite introduction of St. Paul's name in connexion with the martyrdom imply that in the mind of the historian there was a direct relation between the two personalities and the two movements initiated by them. It is natural to suppose that St. Paul, a native of Tarsus in Cilicia, was a member of the synagogue of " Cilicians and Asians " in which were found Stephen's most violent opponents and that the fact that Stephen, like himself a Hellenist, a member of the same or similar type of synagogue, had become an apostate and a rebel against the faith of his fathers contributed in no slight degree to his fierce anger against the Stephen movement and to the relentless ferocity with

which he directed the persecution against it. The calm fortitude of Stephen in the hour of his death and the complete assurance of the faith displayed in his last prayers cannot have been without a very real effect upon the great soul of the Apostle that was to be and may have been the initial cause of the restlessness of spirit and searching of heart which only the vision on the road to Damascus was able to pacify.

And yet it is not quite correct to designate Stephen as a possible Paul. There was much in Stephen's conception of Judaism which prepared the way for St. Paul's gospel. The failure inherent in Judaism considered as a declension from the pure Mosaic religion, the blindness with which it rejected all spiritual and prophetic teaching and murdered its exponents made any real restoration of true religion among the Jews impossible within its own province, and the harvest field of Christianity must, therefore, be looked for in other directions. Thus Stephen's teaching led directly to the great Apostle's demand that the Gentiles should become recipients of the Gospel of Christ freely and without any Jewish limitations. And yet the two teachers were not entirely at one, and this statement applies more especially to their respective views of the law. To Stephen the law was God's word, permanent, enduring, and life-giving, and Christ came to restore it to its pristine meaning and power, while St. Paul sets the law against Christianity. It may be holy, but it is only a schoolmaster to bring to Christ, and it does not inherently possess the power of "making alive." To Stephen the receiving of the law "at the hands of angels" was a decisive proof of its permanent value, but to Paul it was a mark of inferiority and transitoriness. Stephen had after all not freed himself sufficiently from Jewish ideas and prepossessions to

have achieved what his greater successor did in bringing the Gentile world to the feet of Christ.

So on the whole St. Stephen appears as a lonely and isolated figure among the great personalities of the primitive Church. An out-and-out rebel against the religion he had inherited, not in complete sympathy with the leaders of the religion he adopted, and not in full accord with the great Apostle with whom he had most in common, he occupies a position all his own. And yet by the very force of his character, by the intense spirituality of his mind, and above all by the perfect beauty of his death he will for all time attract and command the admiration and reverence of all who take the trouble to understand his story.

MAURICE JONES.

WHEN WAS JESUS CHRIST BORN?

IT cannot be denied that the chronology of the life of Christ is a subject bristling with difficulties. This results from the fact that the earliest Christian writers were chiefly occupied in spreading the teaching of the divine Master and gave very little attention to the chronological data of His life, which were matters of common knowledge when they wrote, and from the fact that subsequent writers who referred to these data as matters of oral tradition, generally lacked the astronomical and hemerological knowledge needed in order to give precise determination to these data and to draw them out into a clear hemerologic system.

He who searches the works of earlier and later writers for exact chronological data of the life of Christ is soon brought to a standstill by such a medley of conflicting opinions as recall the words of Persius, "quaeque sequenda forent, quaeque vitanda vicissim," and ends by concluding that he labours

in vain and that results are impossible of attainment. This is the definite conclusion, generally speaking, come to by all who have laboured in this field,—a conclusion held by them in all good faith. But we venture to think that, except where the exact sciences are concerned, one should hesitate to use the word "impossible," and that many chronological problems of the life of Christ can be resolved by the student who has a competent knowledge of astronomy and hemerology, and can interpret accurately the historical and chronological data furnished by the ancient authors.

A mastery of the astronomical data and a competent knowledge of hemerology enable one to discover the stones of stumbling in the chronology of the life of Christ, and how to avoid them, and to understand why so many writers have missed the true path. Of these stones of stumbling we can give here only a few examples:—

(*a*) The application to the times of Christ of the Jewish calendar of the rabbis Adda and Hillel the younger, which was first adopted only on the evening of September 23, A.D. 344.

(*b*) The confusion of the true Olympiads with the Olympiads as reckoned by the Orientals, who bring them down to a later date.

(*c*) The confusion of the years as reckoned in the reign of Augustus with the years of the reformed Julian calendar, which took effect January 1, 709 A.U.C., or with the years as reckoned from the death of Julius Cæsar, March 15, 710 A.U.C.

(*d*) The confusion of the years as reckoned from the battle of Actium, September 2, 722 A.U.C., with the Egyptian years, which begin on August 29, 724 A.U.C.

(*e*) The confusion of the years reckoned according to the number of the consulships with those reckoned in the ordinary manner.

(*f*) The erroneous determination of the eclipse of Nicæa, recorded by Phlegon, which actually took place on November 24, A.D. 29, at 11.43 A.M., Jerusalem mean time.

(*g*) Different methods of computing the years of one and the same reign.

These, and such as these, are the stones of stumbling which one must know how to avoid. One must also be able to reconstruct the calendars of that epoch according to the various hemerologic systems in vogue, and to translate one into terms of another. He who does not know how to do all this, had best leave the whole subject alone, for his pains will be fruitless in result.

Unhappily few indeed, among the writers on this subject, know how to make an astronomical calculation based on the mean revolution of the moon, and nearly all are at sea on the science of hemerology ; from this it results that the skein becomes ever more entangled, and the only proper course is to turn one's back on the work of others and to attack the problem afresh for ourselves.

The problem, then, which we have to solve is this :— What is the exact date of the birth of Jesus Christ ?

The Evangelists inform us that Jesus was born in the time of Augustus, Herod the Great being the King in Judaea, at which time a census was taken by Quirinius the governor of Syria, and that He spent His first Passover at Jerusalem in the forty-sixth year of the reconstruction of the Temple.

Justin also asserts that Jesus was born at the time of the census made by Quirinius. Irenaeus says that He was born about the year 41 of Augustus. The other early writers tell us nothing more, until we reach Clement of Alexandria, who is the first to give us detailed chronological data : these data we must examine attentively, although they have been discredited or neglected by so many authors. Clement

wrote about A.D. 190; but before examining his chronological data it is well to remind ourselves that, like Origen, Tertullian, and Augustine, he belongs to that group of writers who held that Jesus lived only thirty years three months and a few days. This opinion was contested only by Irenaeus, who sought to prove that Jesus lived about fifty years, thus contradicting himself,—for he affirms that He was born about the year 41 of Augustus and died when Pilate was governor. Irenaeus confounds the years of the reign of Augustus with those of the Julian reform: about the year 41 means about 749 A.U.C.

Clement and others of the same school formed the opinion they did because they knew with certainty that Jesus died in the month of March, in the consulate of Fufius and Rubellius Geminus, i.e. 782 A.U.C., and wished to reconcile the verse in Luke which refers to the fifteenth year of Tiberius Caesar (Luke iii. 1), which, according to them, corresponded to the year 782 A.U.C., with this precise chronological datum of theirs, going back to the first century.[1]

It is needful to observe, however, that Luke reckons the years of the Emperor Tiberius Caesar from January 16, 765 A.U.C., i.e. from the day of the celebration of the triumph of Tiberius over the Pannonians and the Dalmatians, and of his exaltation to the imperial throne as colleague and adopted son of Augustus. Luke makes his intention clear

[1] One may call attention to the learned article on the death of Christ by P. Ilario Rinieri, entitled "The Year of the Saviour's Death," published in *La Scuola Cattolica*, 5th series, vol. x., April 1, 1916. In this article the author by historical argument reaches the conclusion that Jesus was crucified in March, 782 A.U.C. The learned Barnabite P. Camillo Melzi D'Eril, in his article "The Fourteenth Nisan of the Year 29 A.D.," published in the *Atti dell'Accademia Pontificia dei Nuovi Lincei* (Anno xlviii., Tom. xlviii., Sessione vii., 23rd June, 1895) maintains by scientific arguments the opinion that Jesus was crucified March 18, A.D. 29, or 782 A.U.C.

to us by adding to the name Tiberius that of Caesar, in order to indicate the act of adoption. Luke's reckoning is exact, because coins of the fifteenth year of Tiberius are in existence, which bear on the reverse side the date of his triumph, xvii. Kal. Feb., or January 16, which date marks also the commencement of his imperial authority.

Clement and the other writers of his group, including Augustine, reckon the years of Tiberius from the day of the death of Augustus, September 19, 767 A.U.C., and according to their system of computing the years by the consulships they take away three whole years from the life of Christ, incorrectly interpreting the verse in Luke, being ignorant of its hemerologic ground. This verse gives us, as we have seen, the date January 16, 765 A.U.C., as is shown by the coins of Tiberius, which in all probability were current in Luke's own time.

Taking account, then, of this anachronism of Clement (which gives three years too few), let us examine the data he has left us in the Stromateis (ed. Potter, Oxon. 1715, I. 406 sqq.) Before combating the opinion of those who held that Jesus was born the 25th Pachow of the 28th year of Augustus (i.e. May 20, 751 A.U.C.), and that of those who held that He was born the 25th Phamenoth (i.e. April 20), Clement affirms that Jesus was born in the year 28, and that from the death of Christ to the destruction of Jerusalem there elapsed 42 years and three months; that from the destruction of Jerusalem to the death of Commodus there elapsed 128 years, ten months and three days; and that from the birth of Christ to the death of Commodus there elapsed 194 years, one month and thirteen days.

A simple calculation shows that Clement's manuscript must have been altered by the copyists. Thus :—

	Years.	Months.	Days.
Life of Jesus according to Clement . .	30	4 (about)	–
From death of Jesus to destruction of Jerusalem	42	3	–
From destruction of Jerusalem to death of Commodus	128	10	3
Total :	201	5	3

But according to Clement's text the total should be 194 years, one month and thirteen days. Thus we have mathematical demonstration that the copyists transcribed carelessly the figures of Clement, who certainly was too good a chronologist to fall into such gross error. The question then arises, is it possible to correct the errors of the copyists and to find out the exact figures which Clement wrote ? It is quite possible, as we shall see immediately.

Let us begin with the duration of our Lord's life, which Clement estimated as thirty years, three months and some days. Clement knew that Jesus died on the eve of the full moon of March in the consulship of the two Gemini, and by means of the golden number discovered by the Athenian Metow, he knew how to determine the occurrence of a new moon or a full moon ; and even if he had not known that, the calendars in the Alexandrian library would inform him that there was a full moon on Saturday, March 19, 782 A.U.C., the two Gemini being consuls, and that the eve of the full moon was Friday, March 18. Clement, who made a month consist of thirty days according to Egyptian usage, needed to allow for the two days lacking in February and the eighteen days of March, and as $2+18=20$, he certainly held that Jesus lived thirty years, three months and twenty days.

The second datum, from the death of Jesus to the destruction of Jerusalem, could easily be fixed by Clement. He had but to calculate from March 18, 782, to August 10, 823 A.U.C., the date of the burning of the Temple and of the

taking of Jerusalem by the legionaries of Titus: and so he easily reached the result, forty-one years and four months and twenty-two days.

The third datum, from the destruction of Jerusalem, August 10, 823 A.U.C., to the death of Commodus, strangled by the athlete Narcissus, December 31, 945 A.U.C., was with equal ease determined by Clement as 122 years, four months and twenty-one days.

Let us now sum up the data as Clement must have noted them in his original manuscript before it was maltreated by the copyists.

	Years.	Months.	Days.
Life of Jesus	30	3	20
From the death of Jesus to the destruction of Jerusalem	41	4	22
From the destruction of Jerusalem to the death of Commodus	122	4	21
Total	193	11	63

Making the necessary reduction, we have 194 years, one month and three days.

Such beyond doubt were the figures written by Clement, and for the rest the data given above are so near to those which the copyists have mishandled, that we can explain how they went astray without much difficulty. It may also be that Clement, who would indicate the numbers by letters of the Greek alphabet, wrote an indistinct hand, and one can see how the copyist has mistaken β (=2) with η (=8), and has copied 128 instead of 122.

If to the figures which Clement must have written (194 years, one month and three days) we add the three years of anachronism committed by him and the writers of the same school, caused by their misinterpretation of the 15th year of Tiberius (Luke iii. 1), we shall have 197 years, one month and three days. Now if we go back from December 31, 945 A.U.C., (the day of the death of Commodus), 197 years,

one month and three days, we arrive at November 28, 748 A.U.C., the day on which Jesus Christ was born. November 28, 748, calculated according to the exact Julian system, fell on a Sunday; but since the pagan priests fell into error about the dominical letter, assigning to 748 the letter G instead of the correct letter C, that Sunday was called November 25, instead of November 28. Consequently Sunday, November 25, 748 A.U.C., corresponds to Sunday, November 28, 6 B.C., and that day must be fixed upon as the birthday of our Lord.

Before, however, making an absolute affirmation on the subject, let us see if there be not other arguments, based on data from the earliest sources, which confirm the conclusion we have reached.

Luke informs us that when Jesus began His public ministry, He was about thirty years of age (Luke iii. 23). This must mean that, by some days more or less, Jesus had completed the thirtieth year of His age, the year at which permission to teach was granted according to the Mosaic law and Jewish custom.

Luke, also, tells us that Jesus began to teach in the 15th year of Tiberius, and, on the basis of the coinage, this year must be computed from January 16, 765 A.U.C. Now the 15th year of Tiberius Caesar ran from January 16, 779, to January 16, 780 A.U.C., which signifies that Jesus had then completed His thirtieth year, or had entered on His thirty-first, according to the common way of speaking. Now if from 779 we subtract thirty years and some months, we arrive at the last months of 748 A.U.C., and this agrees with the conclusion we have drawn from the statement of Clement.

The Gospel according to John informs us that during the first Messianic Easter the Jews said to Jesus: "Forty and six years was this temple in building, and wilt thou rear it in three days?" (John ii. 20). We know that Herod

decreed the reconstruction of the Temple in 734 A.U.C., and if to that year we add 45, we have the 46th year. And as 734 + 45 = 779, Christ's first Passover must be dated 779 A.U.C., or A.D. 26, which is the Jewish sacred year (not to be confounded with the civil year), 3787 from the creation of the world according to the Hebrews.

The number 3787 is perfectly divisible by 7–541 ×7=3787, and accordingly this year was a sabbatical one.

The tables of the eclipses inform us that on Wednesday, Feb. 6, A.D. 26, or 779 A.U.C.., there occurred an eclipse of the sun at 10.01 A.M., Jerusalem mean time; from that datum we can establish the date of the full moon following as Friday, March 22, 5.07 P.M., and that of the Jewish Passover,—from Friday evening, 22nd, to Saturday evening, March 23, 779 A.U.C. At that time, as we have seen, Jesus had completed thirty years and several months, and by making the necessary subtraction we arrive at the last months of 748 A.U.C. as the date of His birth, and this agrees with what we have deduced from the data of Clement.

The Evangelists and the earliest writers maintain that Jesus was born at the time of the census made by Cyrenius, or Publius Sulpicius Quirinius, and Justin says: "As you may know from the description of the census made by Quirinius your governor in Judaea," and adds that Joseph on that occasion moved to Bethlehem in conformity with the Roman law: "Si vero quis agrum in alia civitate habet, in ea civitate profiteri debet in qua ager est." (Law 4, § 2, Dig. Lib. L. Tit. xv.) Joseph, then, must have been the owner of a field near Bethlehem. It is, however, undeniable that no true and proper census was taken in 748 A.U.C., and we must conclude that Luke and the other early writers used the word in an inexact sense, while holding that they narrate an indisputable fact. As a matter of fact Cyrenius, or Publius Sulpicius Quirinius, a man who enjoyed the full

confidence of Augustus, was in Syria at the close of 748, and had taken command of the four legions quartered in Syria, Phœnicia and Cilicia, in order to lead them against the Amanidi, tribes that inhabited the mountains of Aman, who had risen in revolt against the authority of Rome. Quirinius, as legate and representative of the Emperor, had also authority over Herod, who stood in a certain relation of vassalage to Augustus. There is reason to hold that Quirinius obliged Herod, anxious at that time to be reconciled with Augustus, to compel his subjects to take the oath of fealty to the Romans, or to the Emperor Augustus. Herod was obliged to second the will of the Emperor, and as a matter of fact, Josephus narrates how Herod, about two years before his death, compelled his subjects to swear fealty to the Romans, and how six thousand Pharisees, who refused to swear, were condemned to pay a fine, which was paid by the wife of Ferora, brother of Herod. Now if the taking of this oath were surrounded with forms analogous to those used for a Roman census, there would be nothing strange in that fact.

Kepler, the discoverer of three of the four fundamental laws of our planetary system, occupied himself with this census in a writing attached to his book *De Stella Nova in Pede Serpentarii*, in which writing he affirms that the date of the order for taking this oath and the date when it was actually taken, must be fixed in the months of October and November of the Julian year 40, or 748 A.U.C. Kepler's affirmation accords with the results drawn from the data of Clement, which place the birth of Christ at the close of November 748 A.U.C., and is a most powerful argument in support of that date as the correct one.

There is another reason for holding the correctness of this date. From very early times the Christians celebrated Epiphany on January 6. Now in the Greek the word

Epiphany has such meanings as, "presentation," "showing forth," "setting forth,"—meanings that have small reference indeed to the visit of the Magi, but which apply admirably to the presentation in the Temple. According to the Mosaic law, the presentation should take place on the fortieth day from the birth of the firstborn. If we go back forty days from January 6, we have the six days of January, thirty-one of December and three of November, and arrive exactly at November 28 as the date of the birth of Jesus.

And our final argument is as follows. If we take the ecclesiastical calendar and apply it to the year 748 A.U.C., or better, to the year 6 B.C., we see that Sunday, November 28, is that called the Advent of Our Lord Jesus Christ. This shows that the Roman ecclesiastical calendar is based on the date of the birth of Christ, while the Ambrosian calendar, which takes its point of departure from November 11, is based on the baptism of Christ, which took place on November 8, 778 A.U.C., as can be shown by the aid of the early writers and the science of hemerology.

It appears, then, that every sound line of argument leads us to Sunday, November 28, 6 B.C., as the true date of the birth of Jesus Christ. No other date has such sound hemerologic and historic arguments to support it.

The dates in April and May, which Clement brings forward only to reject, based as they are on a certain interpretation of a prophecy in Daniel, are also to be rejected because of pagan origin, and connected, the first with the natal day of Rome and the second with the festivals of Maia and of Bacchus.

The date, January 6, which has the support of Epiphanius and the followers of Basilides as the true date of Christ's birth, must in like manner be rejected because January 6 corresponds to the 11th of the Egyptian month Tebeth, the festival of the finding again of Osiris, and thus of pagan origin. For the rest Epiphanius affirms that Jesus was

born on January 6, that the visit of the Magi took place on January 6, that He was baptized by John the Baptist on January 6. It is enough to remark that the fondness of Epiphanius for the date of Epiphany is explained by the fact that it is also his own name-day. And indeed in all matters of chronology and hemerology Epiphanius is more confused and misleading than any other ancient writer, but, once the reason for his errors is known, some light may be got even from him.

Chrysostom also rejects the date of January 6 as of pagan origin.

Augustine supports December 25 as the true date, and this was the view generally held in the fourth century; but it is to be rejected as of pagan origin. Augustine maintains that Jesus was born on December 25 and was crucified on March 25 in the consulship of the two Gemini. In determining these two dates his judgment was no doubt swayed by the calendar of Julius Caesar, which fixed the winter solstice on December 25, and the spring equinox on March 25, as though the life of Jesus should fall in with these astronomical phenomena. And for the rest the Julian calendar, compiled by the Egyptian astronomer Sosigenes, did not take account of the precession of the equinoxes, so that it is now thirteen days behind. This fact is enough to invalidate Augustine's dates. And further, it is beyond doubt that Jesus was crucified on the eve of the Passover, or the eve of the full moon. Now on March 25, 782 A.U.C., the moon had passed her last quarter, so that Augustine's date for the death of Jesus must be erroneous, and it must be confessed that this most learned writer knew nothing of hemerology.

In the fourth century December 25 was fixed on as the date of Christ's birth, either because the true date had by that time been forgotten,—although it was to be found

implicitly in the first Sunday in Advent with which the ecclesiastical year began,—or because they wished in the East to christianise the festival of Mithras which fell on December 25; and in the West the festival of the Saturnalia, which fell about that time and was certainly no school of morality.

The intention was a good one and assisted the religious propaganda. From this determination of the date of Christ's birth many festivals had their dates displaced by four weeks: the presentation in the Temple, for example, instead of falling on January 6, fell on February 2, twenty-eight days later, while January 6 became the festival of the visit of the Magi, which really took place twenty-eight days earlier, December 9, 749 A.U.C.

The method followed hitherto by the studious to find out the true chronology of the life of Jesus Christ has not given sure results, because it has suffered from inherent defects. In order to reach secure conclusions one must have sufficient astronomical knowledge and a complete mastery of hemerology; so equipped one must examine all the writers on the subject, from the earliest downwards, in order to make a collection (if I may so express myself) of all the mistakes they have made through their ignorance of hemerology, to search out the explanation of these mistakes, and thus find the stone of stumbling which has brought them to confusion. Only by following such a method can one discover the precise dates which not infrequently leap forth unexpectedly, as of themselves, during a process of investigation, producing a sense of wonder in the person who follows such studies according to this method and with a mind free from all preconceptions.

Let me give one example. It is enough to know the true date of the eclipse of Nicaea recorded by Phlegon, in order to discover all the hemerologic errors committed by Diony-

sius the younger, and so to see leap forth the date of the death of Jesus, which agrees with what the earliest writers say when purged of their hemerologic errors, including the Acts of Pilate, which go back to the first century; this date is xv. Kal. Aprilis, or March 18, 782 A.U.C.

My study of this subject for more than ten years has resulted in these three fundamental data. Jesus was born on Sunday, November 28, 6 B.C.: He spent His first Passover at Jerusalem, Saturday, March 23, A.D. 26: He was crucified on Friday, March 18, A.D. 29. The life of Jesus lasted for thirty-three years, three months and twenty days.

Confronted by these fundamental data furnished by hemerology, the discrepancies which so many have discovered between the four evangelists, disappear as by enchantment and are seen to be only apparent, not real. Thus the famous discrepancy between John's account of the last supper and that of the first three evangelists, about which rivers of ink have flowed from early times, disappears of itself. The first three evangelists speak of the Passover which falls on the evening of the commencement of the 14th of the first month, then called Abib, now Nisan (Lev. xiii. 5–6); John speaks of the Passover which, when he wrote, was celebrated on the evening of the commencement of the 15th Nisan. The contradiction vanishes because the first three evangelists follow one hemerologic system and John follows another, and between the two there is a difference of twenty-four hours. Whoever knows the difference between the two systems must necessarily conclude that the Synoptists and John say one and the same thing, and that there is but an apparent contradiction between them; such an one must also come to the conclusion that all those who maintain, like Didon, that Jesus was crucified the 15th Nisan, commit a grave hemerologic error, and an historic

error also, because sentences of death were not carried out on the 15th Nisan.

To show the importance of hemerology I shall close with an affirmation that to many will seem very exaggerated. It is this : given the historic exactitude of the Biblical data and those of Josephus, hemerology enables us to determine the hour, the day, the month and the year of the exodus of the Israelites from Egypt.

And in fact, after one has made the tedious calculations that the case requires, one reaches the result that Moses and the Israelites left Egypt, or Goshen, or Rameses near Heliopolis, between two and five o'clock in the afternoon of Wednesday, April 3, 1330 B.C., in the reign of Menenphtah II., thirteenth son and successor of Rameses II., the Sesostris of the Greeks. The chronology of the Israelites, which places the Exodus in the year 1313 B.C., is in error by seventeen years, owing to their calculating the years of each reign in round numbers, neglecting the fractions of a year which in process of time amounted to about seventeen years, as can easily be shown.

If hemerology can solve problems of this nature, which, at first sight, it would seem folly to attempt to solve, it is surely possible also to solve the problem of the exact chronological data of the life of Jesus Christ. To affirm the impossibility of such a solution, as many have done and still do, is as unwise as was the old proverb, " as impossible as flying," which to-day has become a non-sense.

ENRICO MASINI.

THOUGHTS ON INFANT BAPTISM.

The simplification of theology which began long before the present war is likely to proceed at an accelerated pace when the great struggle has died down, and men are remodelling their lives. Strong tendencies will then operate to expel from the creed or practice of the Church every element which cannot be put in a direct relation to Christ and His redeeming influence. But the effort to discard superfluities and go straight to the heart of things is symptomatic of a sense for reality which may make for recovery as well as rejection: it may be that aspects of the Gospel which had become obscure will make a new appeal. And if this should happen, one of the first doctrines to benefit by sharpened appreciation may well be Infant Baptism. People who used to be certain about nothing in Baptism except that it did not regenerate ought to feel that in the Baptism of little children a presentation of the Gospel is enshrined without which Christianity would be a poorer thing.

There is nothing strange in the fact that Infant Baptism should have caused difficulty. It rather would be strange if it had not. Children are a disconcerting fact to many theories, and it is only what might have been expected that the science which theorises religious experience should be disconcerted too. But what is often forgotten is that the difficulty about Baptism is only one of a class of difficulties scattered over theology, all connected with childhood and its special qualities. Theology would be relieved of a good many problems if everybody was born an adult, though in that case still bigger problems would emerge. Just because everybody is born an infant all kinds of hard questions arise. In what sense can we say that an infant is a

child of God ? Is an infant sinful ? If Christ is Divine, how could He start as an infant ? Can regeneration take place in infancy ? Are infants immortal, and if they die in the first months of life what sort of blessed future can be ascribed to them ? Every one can see that when we proceed to add the question : Is Baptism appropriate to infants ? it is not a sudden change to a new order of difficulty, but simply one more difficulty of precisely the old kind. One and all they arise from the circumstance that the Gospel, as it confronts the believing mind, is a message of personal and spiritual truth, while the personality of infants is so mmature that it can scarcely be said to exist in any moral sense. Hence there seems to be no affinity between the two realities we are trying to bring into relation. It is a formidable difficulty, as I have said, but it is not in the least mitigated by abolishing Infant Baptism. Whether or not we baptize them, children nevertheless exist, and from the very outset the Gospel either has or has not a gracious relation to them. If it has—and few would deny so much—then we have to search for a standpoint from which that relation may be seen as figured and expressed in Baptism.

The two gravest objections to Infant Baptism are these. First, it is held, Infant Baptism is not enjoined in the New Testament, nor is there any New Testament record of its prevalence. As late as the third century familiar facts suggest that the custom even then was far from being universal. " Why does the age of innocence make haste to have its sins remitted ? " asks Tertullian. Secondly, the practice of Infant Baptism appears to be discordant with the meaning of Christianity, as embodied in the New Testament and reannounced by the Reformers. If there is one truth on which the Reformers, without exception, would have staked everything, it is that Christian salvation is relative to faith.

Infants do not have faith. In their case, accordingly, Baptism has no more significance than any other purely external rite, and ought to be extruded from a spiritual religion.

No answer is possible to the first objection except to admit it frankly. There is no evidence, for example, that the household of the Philippian gaoler included young children. The passage dealing with mixed marriages in 1 Corinthians (vii. 12–16) plainly indicates that in the Apostolic Age it had not occurred to any of the religious leaders that children should be baptized even when the father or mother was a Christian. When St. Paul describes the children of such marriages as " holy " it is expressly on account of a parent's faith, not in virtue of their having been baptized. Jesus gives the injunction that children should be brought to Him, not to Baptism (Matt. xix. 14) ; and when His beautiful saying that to enter the Kingdom we need to become like little children is quoted in support of Infant Baptism, it is forgotten that the childlike mind He declares to be essential is not the absence of consciousness, but the presence of real trust, humility and wonder.

It is indeed true that Infant Baptism is nowhere explicitly forbidden in the New Testament, and that no cogent proof can be given that none of the Christian households or house-fellowships of that date included very young children. It would certainly be odd if it were not so in some one case ; only, even so the children may not have been baptized. It is also true and important that in New Testament days the father was invariably regarded as standing for his family in religious matters, and no doubt it would have seemed an unnatural thing that the father should make a complete change in his religious condition and that his children should be excluded from it. Yet there is nothing in all this

that amounts to proof. Positive evidence for Infant Baptism in the first century is wholly lacking.

That, it must not be forgotten, is precisely what might have been anticipated. To begin with, the Church was a mission Church, coming slowly into existence through the preaching of the Gospel; it was being built up as a result of the faith of individuals. Only by degrees did it change into a Christian community with the faith of individuals built up out of it. Even to-day the Baptism of infants is in place only where the children grow up in the midst of a living Church. The reason is that Baptism exhibits its meaning and unfolds its spiritual consequences not all at one moment but gradually as the child lives and grows in vital interaction with a Christian environment.

Again, it must be conceded that when Infant Baptism began to make headway, during the first centuries, it was helped into currency by the magical conceptions which had early attached themselves to the Baptism of adults. "Whether infants or adults were baptized, baptism in either case was held to be a mystery which involved decisive consequences of a natural and supernatural kind. It was the general conviction that baptism effectually cancelled all past sins of the baptized person, apart altogether from the degree of moral sensitiveness on his own part; he rose from his immersion a perfectly pure and perfectly holy man."[1] The Spirit hovered over the sacramental water, converting it into a bath of regeneration and renewal. The actual seed of a blessed future life was implanted by the rite. Without the rite no one could be saved. This general idea of Baptism partly supplied a motive for its novel administration to young children, and conversely the practice of baptizing young children appeared to justify the thought that the sacrament exerted a saving effect without reference to

[1] Harnack, *Expansion of Christianity*, i. pp. 483–4.

any conscious faith or penitence. If at first it had seemed better to postpone until just before death the rite which swept all sin away, this consideration was eventually more than balanced by the feeling that if Baptism is the foundation of a Christian life, and the pre-condition of receiving all other saving gifts, it could hardly be administered too soon.

Turning now to the second objection, which is doctrinal more than historical and is to the effect that Infant Baptism runs counter to the meaning of the Gospel as a spiritual message, we may recall how much trouble the Reformers had over this very point. Luther is a good instance. Naturally he started with the New Testament principle that sacrament and faith go together; this was fixed for him by his revolt against the Roman theory of *ex opere operato*. But he believed also that Christ had expressly enjoined the Baptism of infants; can we then predicate faith of them? Can infants believe? His vacillations in reply are curious. First he evades the point, and says he will leave the question to the learned expert. Only he would have it noted that God has given the Spirit to very many baptized in infancy, which looks like a reward of obedience to the Lord's command. Next he tries to solve the problem after all, urging that we should bring children to the font in the trust and hope that they do believe, and with the prayer that God would give them more faith. Finally, still unsatisfied, he boldly claims that the sacrament works faith in the child, but how he does not say.

It certainly will not commend the Christian religion to thoughtful men with a keen ethical sense if Infant Baptism should come to be defended by reference to the subliminal consciousness; that mysterious entity which to-day plays so many parts. There has always been a tendency to remove the fact of experience of regeneration from the clear region of moral consciousness to some dimly-lit sphere.

Much, indeed, might be said to prove that what the Westminster Confession itself teaches is Baptismal Regeneration plus the doctrine of Election ; elect infants, that is, *may* be regenerated by or through the ordinance. If this be so, clearly regeneration is in no vital connexion with faith—a tolerably serious matter for a religion claiming to be spiritual. We can only say that if the Divine new creation is a process in the unconscious depths of the soul, it is unrelated to the Gospel, which is a message addressed to moral spirit, and seeks to elicit a change in our willed attitude to God. Truth as it is in Jesus operates by its meaning, and for unconsciousness meaning simply does not exist. We turn salvation into a nature-process, like atmospheric influences telling on the body, when we divorce it from conscious appreciation and personal trust.

But we need not resort to such devices. Infant Baptism is simply the form of Baptism to which the Church was led by the progress of its experience illumined by the Spirit, and its justification consists in a complete harmony with the interior sense of the Christian Gospel. Owing to the fact that Christianity came to be a thing of families and generations as well as of individual souls, with a continuous life behind it and around it a redeemed society, the situation to which Baptism had to be applied changed in one crucial particular. It was no longer confronted with pure heathenism. Children were born whose lives began within the Christian area. The Church felt it necessary to decide how the blessing of which Baptism is an index was to be related to the new conditions : her reply (whether at the moment defended by good Scriptural or doctrinal arguments matters little) was Infant Baptism ; and there are excellent grounds for holding that she was right.

(1) Jesus' attitude to children is significant. We read (Mark x.) that mothers came to Him with their little ones,

and that He received them kindly. He did not preach to them; but He took them up in His arms, put His hands upon them, and blessed them. What does this mean? It means that even for those who could not have understood His teaching Jesus nevertheless had a real gift; a gift He could impart and they could receive, namely His love. Through His loving touch the grace of God came to them at that moment in the way best suited to their age, and who shall say that it left no trace? It is no unheard of thing for people to be informed later of some unusual act of tenderness shown them in childhood, and to feel a joy at every thought of it. We need not search behind the love of Jesus for some mysterious ineffable potency changing these children's "nature," or implanting a new germ in the dark abysmal depths of personality; His love itself is the reality, and to these children, or some of them, it may quite well then or afterwards have taught a new view of what love is, and set movements going, of thought and feeling, through which they came to reach out in trust to God.

(2) Infant Baptism is thoroughly and characteristically evangelical, inasmuch as it symbolises, significantly expresses and conveys, the prevenient grace of God. It stands for the priceless truth: "Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that He loved us"; "We love, because He loved us first." But if it stands for this, it embodies the very core of Christianity. The thought that the Father's love is the fount of all redemption; that His grace is sovereign and antecedent; that He does not wait till we have done our part, and then come forward to complete it, but that He does the whole, only leaving to us the task of receiving what He has provided at His own cost—this goes back to the beginning and down to the very roots of Bible religion. "When Israel was a child, then I loved him"; "I have loved thee with an everlasting love, therefore with everlasting

kindness have I drawn thee" ; "Ye have not chosen Me, but I have chosen you"—in all such great utterances there is enshrined a fundamental principle without which the Christian religion would be unrecognisable.

But this thought that God loved us first—that it was His grace, not our toil or merit, which brought the Gospel into existence and placed us within its orbit ; that He cares for us by anticipation, meeting us on life's threshold with love-laden hands—is evangelical from end to end. He is the middle and end of salvation, but very specially He is the beginning. Spiritual life no less than bodily is His creation. Love divine is in advance of our faith, our prayers, our maturity ; from the outset it is *there*, expectant of our dawning trust. That is very like the providing care of a Father.

It was this principle which operated, whether clearly or more dimly, in the minds of the Reformation leaders when they firmly resisted the Anabaptist arguments. What made the situation confusing was that the Anabaptists seemed only to be carrying out the common religious polemic against Rome to its logical issue. If Baptism, like other sacraments, is nothing apart from faith, as we are agreed, then, they contended, infants must not be baptized. Otherwise you are keeping up the practice of magic ceremonies. The important feature of the answer given by the Reformers is not its theoretic basis but its profound religious instinct. Their exegetical and at times their doctrinal arguments are surprisingly weak, and are occasionally put forward with a hesitation which shows how little they satisfied even their authors. But when they keep to the religion of the matter, they are irrefutable. And the supreme reason to which they appeal is just this, that in Christianity we are receivers. "My faith," as Luther said, "does not make the grace which is in Baptism." The initiative is with

Him, always. "'Tis from the mercy of our God that all our hopes begin." He enters my life before my eyes are open to behold Him, or my hand strong enough to grasp His love. Baptism effectively bodies forth this truth that we are born into a spiritual society full of the promises of God; that Christians are around us as trustees while we are still under age, as yet unable to relieve them by personal appropriation of the pledged love. Grace is, as it were, on the ground first; faith in us is a reaction elicited by the presence of grace. So that Baptism is not properly conceived of as a prayer for love: it is God's gift of love, stirring our prayer. Like the Lord's Supper, it is essentially parallel to the Gospel. We cannot say that Baptism means nothing because at the time of administration the child has no faith, any more than we could say there is no redeeming Christ because a given man, after hearing about Christ, has failed to believe. In consequence of Divine love the Gospel came into being long before we were born into the world, though the salvation with which the Gospel is charged is not our salvation until we accept it; similarly in Baptism the Divine purpose to redeem and bless is certified to faith long before we realise the meaning of the promise.

This matter of the objectivity, the real presence, to call it so, of Divine grace in our lives prior to our full conscious and ethical recognition of it, and even during infancy, ought not to be confused with non-moral ideas of what grace is. In the first months and years of life the love of God affects us through the medium most appropriate to that age, viz., parental love. The doctrinal presentation of Jesus to the infant mind would be meaningless, but we cannot believe that a mother's care makes no incipient impression of reality and tenderness, or that this is not the actual genesis of moral and spiritual life in the growing soul. Apart from this antecedent experience of human love the

Gospel itself, when heard in later years, would be sheerly unintelligible. Grace, then, can surround us from the first, in ways indicative of and suffused with all the moral meaning which the child mind can apprehend. Thus the Divine promise signified in Baptism proceeds to fulfil itself from the beginning. And as parental care puts a child in debt to others long before he can serve himself, or choose his own path, so through that very parental care the prevenient love of God Himself is operating.

One who has grown up in a Christian home may therefore give account to himself of his Baptism in some way like the following: "God," he may say, "anticipated me with His goodness, placing me from the outset in the bosom of the Christian people, who look to Jesus in faith. He met me at life's threshold and by the pledge of this sacrament declared me to have an interest in that love of His which Jesus represents, announcing that for me there was a great inheritance awaiting, which should be mine in proportion as I accepted it. He held forth to me, even then, the blessings that are in Christ, and this offer He confirmed and sealed by the appointed sign. I am able to look up and remember thankfully that I have never been a stranger to the love of God."

In other words, the full significance of Baptism can be perceived and the full blessing of it accepted only as the moral consciousness is sufficiently awake to permit of the meaning of Christ being truly appreciated. But in this there is nothing surprising. If Baptism is just a promise clothed in sense, it is quite a common thing for a promise to be taken advantage of at some period subsequent to its first utterance. Any father may by will convey a gift to his young son upon certain conditions; and years afterwards the son may assent tothe conditions, accept the gift, and find in it both happiness and strength. So in later faith we may

lay hold upon the love with which Baptism was charged. May it not help us to trust that love if we realise that the assurance of it was actually given while as yet we could make no response ?

The administration of Baptism, whether to an adult or an infant, is, let us recollect, an act of faith. When a Christian missionary baptizes a catechumen, on profession of faith, he cannot of course predict whether the convert will or will not do honour to the cause of Christ by the steadfastness of his convictions and the integrity of his life. He may grow in nobility of Christian character, or he may break down and utterly fall away. In like manner, it is an act of faith when in Baptism the infant children of Christian parents have the name of Christ named over them. How their life will grow and mature we cannot tell. Possibly it may be wholly disappointing ; yet so far, as we see it against the background of a Christian family and of the never-failing love of God, we have no reason to believe it may not redound to the glory of Christ the Saviour. In any case, through Baptism and its significance He is stretching out His hands to bless them. As we look on ahead, calculating what the future may bring to them, we cannot forget that the supreme perpetual influence playing on their nature will be that very Love by whose personal presence the very dawn of their day was thus made radiant with promise.

H. R. Mackintosh.

THE LAND OF PROMISE.[1]

Deuteronomy xxxiv. 1–4.—"And Moses went up from the plains of Moab unto Mount Nebo, to the top of Pisgah, that is over against Jericho. And the Lord shewed him all the land, even Gilead as far as Dan; and all Naphtali, and the land of Ephraim and Manasseh, and all the land of Judah, unto the hinder sea; and the South, and the Plain, even the valley of Jericho the city of palm trees, unto Zoar. And the Lord said unto him, This is the land which I sware unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob, saying, I will give it unto thy seed: I have caused thee to see it with thine eyes, but thou shalt not go over thither."

It came to be regarded as the tragedy of Moses' life, that he who had delivered the children of Israel from slavery, and led them through the wilderness to the goal of their long journey, was not allowed to enter the Promised Land himself. He must die on the very threshold of attainment, disappointed of his reward. That tragic element, which all the sacred writers notice in the career of Moses, seemed to reach its climax here. What could be the reason? Some bygone sin, no doubt, for which he must pay the penalty. But what the offence was, or when it happened, no one quite knew. In Deuteronomy, the blame is laid upon the people: "The Lord was angry with me on your account";[2] Moses, we imagine, must have been somehow involved in the people's disobedience at Kadesh in the early days of the wandering. In the book of Numbers, however, the Priestly Writer describes an episode in the same place, but at the end of the period of the wandering:[3] Moses and Aaron were told to bring water out of the rock, and they did so; not disobedience, but unbelief and failure to sanctify Jehovah, is alleged as the reason why the two

[1] Preached before the University of Oxford, Septuagesima, Feb. 4, 1917.

[2] Deut. i. 37, iii. 26, iv. 21. [3] Num. xx. 12, xxvii. 13 f.

leaders were to forfeit their reward. Clearly tradition was not unanimous on the subject, and neither the one version nor the other is complete ; yet the tradition remains. Was there, then, in that great career one signal act of failure, one dark hour when the leader himself sank to the level of the multitude, and "spake unadvisedly with his lips"? It would be very natural if something like this happened. We remember John the Baptist in the prison, and Peter in the court-yard, and many another of God's saints, who, overwhelmed for the moment in the common strife, shewed that they were men of like passions with ourselves. Yet while we hold to the tradition of that one recorded failure, we are not bound to connect it with the fact that Moses died without entering Canaan. For it is possible that later ages, reflecting on the circumstances of Moses' death, and holding the naïve theory of rewards and punishments which was current at the time, felt it to be incredible that Moses of all men should leave the earth without receiving his due. Some reason must be found for what looked like a crowning disappointment. But the inconsistency of the reasons given shews that there was no clear view of the matter, hesitation, rather, and uncertainty about the explanation which was offered.

2. However this may be, we do at least equal justice to tradition if we interpret this closing scene as thoroughly in keeping with all that we are told about the prophetic character of Moses. At each of the high moments of his life he is represented in the attitude and office of a prophet. At the moment of his call, when he first encountered the presence of God in the burning bush, he heard the voice which revealed the Name or nature of the God of Israel and announced the divine purpose of deliverance. So it was again on Sinai, when the covenant was made between Jehovah and the tribes, and Moses told the people all the

words of the Lord, that is, the moral requirements which formed the basis of the law, and stayed in the mount forty days and forty nights.[1] The last scene comes as the fitting climax of those that had gone before. We watch him standing on the mountain ridge above the plains of Moab, gazing over the length and breadth of the land which his people were to possess, the vision clear before him, his ears still open to the voice of God, his whole being absorbed in the destiny of his race, and the fulfilment of the divine purpose.

3. It was as a prophet, and not only as a lawgiver, that Moses impressed the minds of later generations. "By a prophet the Lord brought Israel up out of Egypt, and by a prophet was he preserved," says Hosea,[2] conveying his sense of the range and inspiration of Moses' work. The liberator of the Hebrew tribes was the man who, as a prophet, first proclaimed the fundamental article of their faith: Jehovah is the God of Israel; He alone is to be worshipped and obeyed, their Champion and Protector, the only source of all the blessings they enjoyed. Whatever gods other nations might believe in, Israel was committed to the exclusive service of one God. Moreover, Jehovah was no mere nature God, though He might manifest His presence in storm and earthquake; He was no capricious, incalculable divinity, the terror of His prostrate devotees; but different in character from all other gods, essentially a moral Being, who demands right dealing between man and man as the way to His favour, and never overlooks any wrong which a man may do. To proclaim these fundamental truths, to bind them upon the people by a covenant, to make them the very conditions of their existence as a people, was the work of Moses.

[1] Exod. xxiv. 3, 18.
[2] Hos. xii. 13.

In his day this truth was new truth; he did not receive it handed down from his fathers; he did not discover it by meditation or inquiry; since it came to him neither from others nor from himself, we can only believe that it came to him from God. The traditions tell us of the Angel of Jehovah calling to Moses out of the bush, and of Jehovah descending in the cloud to stand beside His servant and proclaim the Name of the Lord.[1] The language of symbols is used to describe an overwhelming inward experience: certain convictions as to the unseen realities laid hold of him; the very light of God shone into his soul, and revealed to him the foundation of all true religion. He was a prophet then; for he saw and heard the truth in God's own presence, as all the prophets did, and made it known to the men of his time and to the ages after; a prophet, admitted to a peculiar intimacy of communion and directness of inspiration, "mouth to mouth, plainly and not in riddles."[2] Summing up his character and work, another writer declares, "There hath not arisen a prophet since in Israel like unto Moses, whom the Lord knew face to face."[3]

4. The itinerary of the Book of Numbers brings the whole multitude of the Israelites at the close of their wanderings "to the top of Pisgah, which looketh down upon the desert."[4] There, for the first time, they lost the horizon of the wilderness, so long familiar to them, and, for the first time, they looked upon the Promised Land. What impression it made upon them we are not told; only a prophet's eye could read the meaning of that view. To the same spot, Mount Nebo or, as it is sometimes called, "the top of Pisgah," the narrative also brings Moses. Travellers tell us that from the ridge which still bears the name of Nebo, a superb landscape opens out to North and West and

[1] Exod. xxxiv. 5.
[2] Num. xii. 8. [3] Deut. xxxiv. 10. [4] Num. xxi. 20.

South, plateau and mountain, highlands and deep valleys, with the gleaming mirror of the Salt Sea immediately below. This was the land where the fathers had pitched their tents, and the children were to find a settled home! What a prospect of blessedness in store, what a glorious destiny to fulfil! The wonders of God's mercy had brought them so far on their way; the same Providence would be with them still, that strong Angel who marched unseen before them, and made a sanctuary within their camp.

And as the eye of Moses ranged over the far-stretching distance he must have thought of the struggles that awaited his undisciplined tribes. What match were they for the fortresses and walled cities, "the chariots of iron," all the resources of an established civilisation? And he could foresee a harder struggle still. The wandering shepherds of the desert would have to learn to till the soil: a change of habit and occupation, which would bring with it a subtle change in ways of thinking. He who had borne so long with their rebellions in the wilderness knew how quickly they would fall to the level of Canaanite religion and Canaanite standards of life: they would be mingled among the heathen, and learn their works. Is there any sorrow like the sorrow of him, who, with a disinterested and lofty aim at heart, knows that his cause is doomed to be thwarted and betrayed by the very people for whose welfare he has spent his life? Yet it was not to raise despair, but rather to bring hope and consolation, that the vision was vouchsafed to Moses. As he gazed over the scene in which his race was to work out their chequered story he was filled, we may be sure, with a steadfast confidence. For he had sown the seed which in time would bear its fruit. He had made known to his people that Jehovah was their God, the one and only God for them; the God to whom they were bound by the most solemn ties; whose Name and nature

had been revealed as supremely righteous, requiring righteousness of His worshippers; "full of compassion and gracious, slow to anger, plenteous in mercy and truth . . . that will by no means clear the guilty." [1] With a faith like this, the foundation of all true religion, the tribes could face the conflicts, the hardships, the temptations, that lay before them. They would conquer and possess the land of promise; the sovereign purpose of Jehovah held good; He had sworn unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob, saying, I will give it unto thy seed.

As a matter of fact those undisciplined tribes from the desert did win their way into Canaan, and in spite of many failures, did hold their own against a dominant civilisation, and impose themselves upon it, and in course of time absorb it; and the one fact which made the conquest possible was their common faith in Jehovah the God of Israel. The religions of Babylon and Egypt, and of the kindred nations round, led to nothing and lie buried in the dust; Israel's faith, on the other hand, however crude in its earlier stages, contained the seed of life; it grew and widened out; in the strength of it Israel advanced towards a higher destiny.

From Mount Nebo Moses could not have seen all that length and breadth of land which is described in the sacred text. Dan at the foot of Hermon in the North, all Naphtali and all the land of Judah, with the Mediterranean sea in the West, lie beyond the reach of human sight from that position. The writer was carried away by a kind of prophetic enthusiasm; the Samaritan version of the passage goes even further, and makes Moses survey the vast tract "from the river of Egypt to the great river, the river Euphrates"; prophet and psalmist took a still bolder flight when they contemplated the destined borders of Israel and of Israel's king: "His dominion shall be from

[1] Exod. xxxiv. 7.

sea to sea, and from the Euphrates to the ends of the earth." [1] By that time, to the prophetic mind, the faith of Israel had burst all national boundaries; the God of Israel had come to be known as the God of all the world.

5. We have been dwelling upon the final scene in the life of Moses because it suggests a direction for our thoughts at this moment. In the last sight that we have of the great leader, his look is not backward, but forward, knowing well how much the future held of trial and call to effort, yet facing it with a confidence grounded on belief in God's nature, God's presence, God's invincible purpose. We take leave of him standing on the threshold of a new age in the attitude of a prophet, with a vision open before his eyes, and a burning faith in his heart.

And this is the right attitude for Christian men and women at the present turning-point in our national history. We are summoned to look forward, not backward. God forbid that we should be unmindful of His mercies in the past! The pillar of cloud by day and the pillar of fire by night have guided us thus far on our course; we have been disciplined and taught, but with the aim of equipping us for a higher achievement, that we may enter an inheritance which can only be won by a spiritual conquest. I would plead for the prophetic vision and faith, in the noble-minded words of Moses, "Would God that all the Lord's people were prophets, that the Lord would put his spirit upon them!" [2]

We have every right to this prophetic outlook; for prophecy means on God's side revelation, and on man's side response. Has God ceased to make His truth known to us? Does God no longer cleanse the thoughts of our hearts by the inspiration of His Holy Spirit, that we may

[1] Zech. ix. 10; Ps. lxxii. 8.
[2] Num. xi. 29.

both know His will and make it known? Prophecy did not come to an end when the prophetic canon of Scripture was closed; rather, it started afresh when the Spirit of the risen Lord was poured out upon the Church to guide it into all truth. And the meaning of the Incarnation is not exhausted by the historical facts of Christ's life upon earth. The Incarnation embraces a wider plan; it inaugurated a movement, which is nothing less than the continuous revelation of God, and the continuous discovery of God, in the life of man.

We are justified, then, in taking the prophetic view as we look towards the future; and it is the only view which enables us to look with confidence and hope. As his eye travelled over the prospect, Moses, we can well believe, was cheered and strengthened in spirit, because he knew that the principles had been implanted by which alone Israel could fulfil its destiny. Those principles are ours to-day, but illuminated with a larger light, and enriched by the religious experience of the ages. We can look forward to the future with hope in so far as God is real to us, and Christ, and the Holy Spirit, in so far as we believe in God's presence with His people, and determine to render Him that moral service of righteousness and brotherhood which is the requirement of His will, the one condition of His favour.

"There remaineth yet very much land to be possessed." [1] It is the future which claims our loyalty, "strong in will, To strive, to seek, to find, and not to yield." We aim at nothing short of conquest in the things of the spirit; we will make God's cause our own; we will work and pray for the coming of His Kingdom. The threats and ragings of the enemy will not shake our resolve. No selfish aim of national greatness will satisfy us, no jealousy for narrow

[1] Josh. xiii. 1.

interests, no "empty talk Of past achievements, and despair of new." Our desire is set upon the promised land. One by one the old boundaries fall away, and there opens out before us the region conquered in God's strength and in accordance with His purpose.

For prophetic significance there is only one other scene which can be set beside that which we have had in our minds. Again we are transported to a mountain-top, "the mount called Olivet," [1] and there the divine Saviour, having accomplished the first stage of His work of deliverance, and surrounded by the little company whom He had taught and trained, points over the landscape to Jerusalem and all Judæa and Samaria, and bids them go out as His witnesses unto the uttermost parts of the earth. "And lo, I am with you all the days."

G. A. Cooke.

SOME CONSIDERATIONS ON THE PASTORAL EPISTLES.

Among the arguments which have been considered to weigh most strongly against the Pauline authorship of the Pastoral Epistles is one which is thus stated by Dr. Moffatt[2]:

"Favourite Pauline phrases and words are totally wanting . . . particles like 'then' (ἄρα), 'wherefore' (διὸ), 'because' (διότι), 'then' (ἔπειτα), 'still' (ἔτι), 'behold' (ἰδὲ, ἰδοὺ), etc, etc., prepositions like 'with' (σὺν = μετὰ of Pastorals), 'instead of' (ἀντὶ), 'until' (ἀχρὶ), 'before' (ἔμπροσθεν), 'beyond' (παρὰ with acc.)." This seems a formidable argument, because the use of particles of this kind is much more characteristic of a writer's style than his general vocabulary, which may easily change with his

[1] Acts i. 8, 12.
[2] *Encycl. Bibl.*, iv. p. 5087.

subject. Yet when the argument is examined it assumes very small proportions; the use of these "characteristic" particles is almost confined to the two earliest groups of St. Paul's epistles. In the epistles of the Captivity they almost disappear, and therefore there is nothing surprising in the fact that they quite disappear from the Pastorals; whatever may be the cause of this disappearance, it seems to be the result of a tendency which was already at work in St. Paul's style, and the argument, instead of being against the Pauline authorship, is thus turned to be slightly in its favour. To put the results in tabular form, they are as follows:—

	Group I. 1 and 2 Thessalonians	Group II. Rom., Gal., 1 and 2 Cor.	Group III. Eph., Phil., Col., Philemon	Group IV. Pastoral Epistles.
ἄρα	2	26	1	0
διὸ	3	18	7	0
διότι	3	6	1	0
ἔπειτα	1	8	0	0
ἔτι	1	13	1	0 (μηκέτι once)
ἰδὲ, ἴδοὺ	0	12	0	0
ἀντὶ	2	2	1 (in quotation)	0
ἄχρι	0	13	2	0
ἔμπροσθεν	4	2	1	0
παρὰ with acc.	0	14	0	0

Thus of the words selected as characteristic of St. Paul's style, διὸ is the only one which had not already almost disappeared in the epistles of the Captivity. Of the seven occurrences of διὸ, five are in the Epistle to the Ephesians, so that for those who (with Dr. Moffatt) reject that Epistle, there are only two for the remaining epistles of the third group.

But we may reasonably ask, why should these particles

alone be selected as specially characteristic of St. Paul's style and not such others as ἀλλὰ, οὖν, ὑπὲρ, εἶτα, ὅστις, ἕως, παρὰ with the genitive? The only reason appears to be, that the latter are found in the Pastoral Epistles and the former are not.

It would seem that the real reason for the disappearance of words like ἄρα, διὸ and διότι is that while the earlier epistles, and more especially the second group, are largely argumentative, all reason for an argumentative tone ceases in the cases of those who, like Timothy and Titus, had "fully known" St. Paul's "teaching, conduct, purpose, faith" (2 Tim. iii. 10).

With regard to σὺν, it is difficult to found an argument on its absence from the Pastoral Epistles when it occurs five times in compounds. The preposition is equally absent from the Epistles of St. John, while it occurs three times in the Gospel, yet no one would think that a reason for assigning the Gospel and Epistles (whoever may be their author) to different writers. St. Paul had always shown a preference for μετὰ with the genitive, which occurs fifty-two times in the epistles of the first three groups, while σὺν occurs thirty-seven times.

Another argument against the Pauline authorship is founded on the large number of ἅπαξ λεγόμενα in the Pastoral Epistles. Within the last two years the first two parts have been published of Moulton and Milligan's *Vocabulary of the N.T. illustrated from the Papyri and other non-literary Sources*. Of the total number of ἁπ. λεγ., 55 come under these first four letters of the alphabet, and of these no less than 35 are to be found in the *Vocabulary*. What is the inference? Surely that St. Paul, writing intimately to two of his life-long friends and disciples, allows himself a greater laxity in the use of non-literary Greek words than he would have thought becoming in his more formal epistles.

With regard to the question, closely connected with that of the genineness of these epistles,[1] whether St. Paul was ever released from that imprisonment at Rome which is recorded in the last chapter of *Acts*, it must of course be admitted that the positive evidence for the release is not absolutely conclusive. But it may be doubted whether sufficient weight has been given to the words of Festus: "I found that he had committed nothing worthy of death" (Acts xxv. 25); and again: "When they were gone aside, they talked between themselves, saying, This man might have been set at liberty, if he had not appealed unto Cæsar" (Acts xxvi. 31, 32). Surely the appeal to Cæsar was not itself a crime for which death could be inflicted. Moreover from Tertullus' speech the frivolous nature of the charge is evident. All that this practised orator can bring against him is: "We have found this man a pestilent fellow, and a mover of sedition [στάσεις has a conveniently vague meaning in Acts xv. 2; xxiii. 7, 10 it amounts to no more than verbal disputes] among all the Jews throughout the world, and a ringleader of the sect of the Nazarenes, who also hath gone about to profane the temple." Of these four purposely vague accusations, the only one of which Roman Law could take account was the second, and this accusation was both false and impossible to prove. In the judgment both of Festus and Agrippa St. Paul was an innocent man, and the mere fact of his appeal could not make him into a criminal. Nor is it probable that any charge was ever brought against him at Rome—the fact that he was there for two years shows that his enemies had not taken the trouble to pursue him thither—and we have no right to suppose that justice had become so bankrupt in the Roman

[1] Few will be found to accept Dr. Vernon Bartlet's contention that room must be found for the Pastoral Epistles in St. Paul's life before his first captivity at Rome.

capital that a prisoner could be put to death for nothing. It was still, it must be remembered, the "golden quinquennium" of Nero, when his character as a ruler stood high, and no hint of persecution had been uttered against Christians. From the epistles of the Captivity it is evident that St. Paul expected release, and if any serious weight is to be given to his words at Miletus—"I know that ye all shall see my face no more"[1]—equal weight ought to be given to that other confident "I know" in Philippians i. 25: "I know that I shall abide and continue with you all." His tone in 2 Timothy is very different: "I am now ready to be offered, and the time of my departure is at hand." Most of those who reject the Pastoral Epistles as a whole, would allow that this last chapter of 2 Timothy contains authentic details.

There are perhaps one or two instances in which our excellent English versions might be amended. In 2 Timothy ii. 15 both A.V. and R.V. translate *ἐργάτην ἀνεπαίσχυντον* by "a workman that needeth not to be ashamed." The only other place in which *ἀνεπαίσχυντος* is known to occur is Josephus: *Ant.* xviii. vii. 1. Herodias is reproaching Antipas for his want of ambition in allowing Agrippa to become his superior. "You should not consider it," says this virago, "a thing *not to be ashamed of* to be inferior to one who the other day lived upon thy charity (*μηδὲ δευτερεύειν ἀνεπαίσχυντον ἡγοῦ τῶν χθὲς καὶ πρώην ἐλέῳ τῷ σῷ διαβεβηκότων*)." This suggests that the true translation in 2 Timothy is "a workman not to be ashamed of." In 2 Corinthians viii. 23 certain brethren are spoken of as "the glory of Christ"—servants of whom the Master is proud; and here it is hinted that there are others of whom He may be ashamed.

[1] From the emphatic position of *ὑμεῖς πάντες* at the end of the sentence, it is probable that it only means, "There are some of you who will not see me again."

In 2 Timothy iv. 3 " having itching ears " sounds excellent, and one would be loth to disturb it, but it is not clear that *κνηθόμενοι τὴν ἀκοήν* can have this meaning. *Κνήθω*—which, according to Liddell and Scott, is the less Attic form of *κνάω* —is to scratch or tickle, and the proper word for to itch is *κνησιάω*. Cf. Plato : *Gorgias* 494C : " Tell me if it is possible for one who itches (*κνησιῶντα*), provided he has plenty of scratching (*τοῦ κνῆσθαι*), to live happily." We suggest then that " having their ears tickled " would be a more accurate translation."

Has not unnecessary difficulty been made about 1 Timothy ii. 15 ? Professor Ramsay has a very interesting discussion about possible meanings of the word *τεκνογονία*, but he and most other expositors take *διὰ* in its instrumental sense. The primary sense of *διὰ* is local or temporal, and though this is less common than the instrumental, it is quite frequent enough in LXX and N.T. to be probable here. Thus in Isaiah xliii. 2 : *ἐὰν διαβαίνῃς δι ὕδατος μετὰ σου εἰμι . . . καὶ ἐὰν διέλθῃς διὰ πυρὸς οὐ μὴ κατακαυθῇς*. Similarly Hebrews xi. 29 and probably 1 St. Peter iii. 20 for the local, and Acts i. 3, v. 9, etc., for the temporal meaning. St. Paul has been speaking of the transgression of the woman, and knowing that Timothy equally with himself is familiar with the passage in Genesis his mind jumps to the penalty of the transgression, which he thinks it unnecessary to state, and then to its redemption in the Christian Church. " She shall be brought through her child-bearing in safety (bodily or spiritual), if they abide, etc." If this be right, the A.V. " saved in child-bearing " gives a better sense than R.V.

In Titus iii. 10 the R.V. text has " heretical " and the margin " factious." It would be better to transfer the margin to the text, for we have no right to read into a writing of the first century the later ecclesiastical use of the word : *αἱρεσιάρχης* is quoted by Moulton and Milligan as

meaning simply a leading man in his profession (medical).

A rather important point seems to have been missed by translating προίστασθαι (Titus iii. 8, 14) by "to maintain good works," or, as in the margin of R.V. "to profess honest occupations." Surely the word has its usual meaning of "to preside over," as in 1 Timothy iii. 4, 12, and the sense is that Christians in a society which is largely made up of non-Christians are to *take the lead* in good (noble) works. It is a call to Christians not to be satisfied with living merely up to the standard of the society around them, but to be full of initiative in searching out and reforming the abuses to which custom has made other people indifferent. The Christian Social Union might find a whole world of inspiration in that one phrase, προίστασθαι καλῶν ἔργων.

The Epistle to Titus brings us up against one whom Professor Ramsay has called the most enigmatic figure in the New Testament. Yet it seems strange that the suggestion made by the late W. H. Simcox in his *Beginnings of the Christian Church*—a book which deserves to be better remembered than it is—has not been more warmly taken up. He writes: "From 2 Corinthians viii. 18, xii. 18 one is led to conjecture that he (Titus) was an elder brother of St. Luke. That the two brothers should be known as Titus and Lucanus would be analogous to the case of the two sons of Vespasian, Titus and Domitianus." Dr. G. H. Rendall has proved almost to demonstration [1] that "the brother whose praise is in the gospel" is St. Luke, and if so it can be proved with almost equal certainty that Titus was his brother. The original reading of 2 Corinthians viii. 18 (accepted by R.V.) was συνεπέμψαμεν δὲ τὸν ἀδελφὸν μετ' αὐτοῦ οὗ ὁ ἔπαινος ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ, which is most naturally translated, "we sent his brother with him," and the reason

[1] G. H. Rendall: *The Epistles of St. Paul to the Corinthians.* Macmillan, pp. 79–83.

for the change to *μετ' αὐτοῦ τὸν ἀδελφὸν* appears to be that when the relationship was forgotten it was felt necessary to bring *τὸν ἀδελφὸν* into closer connexion with the relative clause. Though "brethren" is a common word for Christians "the brother" could scarcely stand alone as meaning a Christian. The only instance in which it appears to do so is in Romans xvi. 23, where "the brother" seems a particularly bald translation, as though it required stating that one who joins in St. Paul's salutation to Christians was a Christian himself. Much more probably we should read: "I, Tertius, who write this epistle, salute you in the Lord. Gaius my host, and of the whole church, saluteth you. Erastus, the treasurer of the city, saluteth you, and Quartus his brother." Thus we have Gaius, Erastus, Tertius and Quartus as the four brothers of the family by whom St. Paul was entertained at Corinth. Again in 2 Corinthians xii. 18, *παρεκάλεσα Τίτον καὶ συναπέστειλα τὸν ἀδελφὸν*, to translate "his brother" relieves the sentence of its apparent abruptness. The supposition that Titus and Luke were brothers goes far to explain another great crux of N.T. interpretation, namely, the question why Titus is not mentioned in Acts; for the same delicate reticence which led St. Luke to hide his personality under the "we" of a few passages, would withhold him from mentioning his brother at all, just as St. John never mentions by name his brother James but only hints at his presence in one passage (cf. Westcott on St. John i. 41) and in another speaks of "the sons of Zebedee" (xxi. 2). [1]

If this supposition be admitted as probable there are several considerations which tend to confirm it. In the first place Titus and Luke were both among the few Gentiles in St. Paul's *entourage*. That Titus was a "Greek" is stated

[1] The bearing of these two passages on the question of the authorship of the gospel is worth considering.

in Galatians ii. 3, and that Luke was also one can hardly be doubted. "Almost all critics are agreed that in Colossians iv. 14 Luke is separated from "those of the circumcision, and therefore was a Gentile Christian" (Plummer's *St. Luke*, p. xviii.). Moreover, both were almost certainly residents, if not natives, of Antioch. Sir W. Ramsay has argued for the Macedonian origin of St. Luke,[1] but in doing so has he not ignored the evidence of Codex Bezae, to which he generally attributes considerable importance? Beside the four "we" sections which are found in the ordinary text of Acts, D has a fifth at xi. 27, closely following the account of St. Paul's arrival at Antioch, where it adds: *ἦν δὲ πολλὴ ἀγαλλίασις, συνεστραμμένων δὲ ἡμῶν.* This shows not only that Luke was one of the early Antiochene converts, but—if Mr. Rackham is right in his interpretation of *συνεστραμμένων* [2]—that he was already engaged in evangelistic work. This is confirmed by Eusebius and Jerome ("Lucas medicus Antiochensis") and also by the much earlier *Præfatio Lucæ*,[3] which describes him as a Syrian of Antioch. Titus was taken from Antioch to Jerusalem for the Apostolic Council. This is his earliest appearance in N.T., but if any credence is to be attached to the *Acts of Paul and Thekla* he had already been one of the companions of Paul and Barnabas on their first journey, and had acted as their dragoman after Mark's departure. He was also a convert of St. Paul, for in that sense we must understand the *γνησίῳ τέκνῳ* of Titis i. 4. Titus and Luke are mentioned together in 2 Timothy iv. 10, where it almost seems that the mention of one suggests that of the other. Thus the

[1] His strong interest in Macedonia is quite satisfied by the fact that, as the "we" sections show, he was left in charge of the church at Philippi on St. Paul's expulsion from that city.

[2] Rackham: *Exposition of the Acts of the Apostles*, p. 172, note 3.

[3] See Hastings' *D.B.*, vol iii., p. 161.

evidence all points to their being fellow-Gentiles, fellow-Antiochenes, fellow-converts of the earliest days of St. Paul, and as they were among the first Gentiles to become Christians we can understand the enthusiastic love and gratitude which led them to become the life-long companions of the great Apostle. All the conditions therefore are in favour of understanding the ἀδελφός of 2 Corinthians viii. 18 and xii. 18 in its most literal sense.

E. F. Brown.

A TRANSFORMATION IN SOCRATIC CRITICISM—THE ANALOGY APPLIED.

In a previous article I dealt with the new views with regard to the Dialogues of Plato which have been given forth within the last year or two by Professor A. E. Taylor in his *Varia Socratica* and by Professor Burnet in his Greek Philosophy, Part I. I gave some account of the reasons these writers advance for regarding the Platonic writings as a much more faithful representation of the teaching of Socrates than we have hitherto believed them to be. The Socrates who speaks in the *Republic* and the *Phædo* is no mere ideal figure, but is the Socrates whom Plato knew, and whose ideas he is seeking to convey to his readers. The problem of the relation of Plato to Socrates has a striking analogy to the principal problem of New Testament criticism, that of the relation of the writer of the Fourth Gospel to the historic Christ; and I pointed out in my previous article that, if Dr. Burnet and Dr. Taylor are able to make out their case for the authenticity of the Platonic dialogues as a record of Socratic teaching, it must have a profound effect on our attitude towards the authenticity of the Fourth Gospel.

So far I have only stated a hypothetical case. I venture in this article to give it a more categorical character and to express the opinion that the evidence, which Dr. Burnet and Dr. Taylor have accumulated in support of their new theory, cannot leave the Socratic question where it was. It is unlikely that the philosophical world will go the whole way with these writers in their Socraticising of the *Phædo* and the *Republic*, but it will probably have to admit, as a result of their investigations, that there is more of the Socratic element in these dialogues than has hitherto been

allowed. Dr. Burnet indeed does not attempt to fly so directly in the face of tradition as to maintain that writings like the *Republic* and the *Phædo*, which have been considered so peculiarly the creations of Plato's genius, are merely a reproduction of the sayings and the opinions of his master. Dr. Burnet allows that these dialogues owe their present form largely to Plato's hand, though they contain in his view a considerable residuum of Socratic doctrine.[1] If Socrates was entirely innocent of the ideal theory, Dr. Burnet fails to see why Plato should be so anxious to foist this creation of his own upon him, and in the presence of those who were contemporaries of Socrates himself.[2] We may not be able to go the whole way with Dr. Burnet in his vindication of the Platonic Socrates; but every open-minded student of his argument must be led to feel that the view that the ideal Socrates of the *Phædo* contains no reflection whatever of the real Socrates, that Socrates never left the regions of purely logical and ethical definition for those of metaphysical speculation, is one of those comfortable but ill-grounded assumptions into which philosophical criticism too easily settles down.

And it appears to me that in the realm of New Testament criticism we are up against the same danger. We are having forced upon us a distinction between the Christ of the Synoptics and the Christ of the Fourth Gospel which is too sweeping. The teaching of the Fourth Gospel, we are told, is on an entirely different plane from that of the Synoptics, so abstract and mystical in its character, that it is impossible to think that the same Christ who spoke the Sermon on the Mount could have spoken these Johannine discourses; and so they must needs be the creation of a later mind. Now we are quite prepared to admit that the Fourth Gospel belongs to a different category from

[1] Burnet, *Greek Philosophy*, p. 149. [2] Ibid., p. 155.

the first three, is representative of a freer and more philosophic treatment of the Gospel. The traces of a later culture, which criticism has found in it, can no longer be disputed. Just as the most recent vindicators of the Socratic tradition do not deny the part that Plato's hand had in the shaping of it, so there is all through the Fourth Gospel the evidence of a point of view which is clearly that of the author himself. This point of view—and this makes the analogy between the two problems in criticism all the closer—is a Platonic one, or, as Professor Burnet would say, a Socratic-Platonic one. The Platonic element has not indeed come directly to the Fourth Gospel but through the medium of the Alexandrian theology. John shows the same dependence on the writings of Philo as does the author of Hebrews, though his quotations are of a freer and less verbal kind.[1] It is unnecessary here to give examples of the Philonic passages in the Fourth Gospel. They will be found in any modern commentary on the Gospel, and for a complete tabulation of them one can consult such an authority as Siegfried's *Philo von Alexandria*. But it is not so much with actual quotations from Philo that we are concerned as with the Platonic modes of thought which this writer borrows from his Alexandrian master, and the traces of which are to be found in all the main discourses of the Gospel. In particular the distinction between earthly things and their heavenly archetypes, which are the true forms of reality, the substance of which the others are but the semblance, is a characteristic note in the message of the Gospel. Christ is described as the *true* Light, the *true* Bread, and the *true* Vine in contrast with the earthly imitations of the Divine original. In the discourse on the Bread of Life this opposition between the two orders of reality is very clearly and fully stated: "Verily, verily, I say unto

[1] See E. F. Scott, *The Fourth Gospel*, p. 55.

you, It was not Moses that gave you the bread out of heaven; but my Father giveth you the true bread out of heaven. For the bread of God is that which cometh down out of heaven, and giveth life unto the world." [1] In this Gospel, then, the sayings of Jesus take a Platonic form, which we cannot for a moment suppose to have been native to the historic Jesus, and which must have been given to them by the writer of the Gospel.

But, while the form of this Gospel is due to the author, it does not follow that he is equally responsible for the matter of it. Of course even the complexion of the Johannine discourses is different from that of the Synoptics, but the question may well be asked whether the contrast between the Synoptics and the Fourth Gospel has not been too sharply drawn, and whether the Synoptics are so devoid of traces of the metaphysical interest as they have been represented to be. Is it so very plain that the Christ of the Synoptics has no tendencies towards higher and more mystical aspects of truth, that there were no elements in His teaching that soared above the ordinary levels of comprehension and were discernible only to a spiritual perception? Are there no signs in the Synoptics themselves of the existence of a more esoteric teaching than that of which they are the depositaries? We have no hesitation in answering the question in the affirmative. To our mind there are most evident traces of a desire on the part of Christ to impart more mysterious instruction than that which is contained in the simple precepts of the Gospel. He would fain attach a hidden meaning to His parables for the good of His disciples, though they were not always able to receive it. Again and again had the disciples to come to Him, saying, "Declare unto us this parable." And Christ seeks to encourage them in the search into the

[1] John vi. 32–33 R.V.

secret things of the Spirit. "Unto you it is given to know the mysteries of the kingdom of God; but to the rest in parables." [1] In face, then, of this fact, reported by the Synoptics themselves, that Christ announced an esoteric side to His teaching which could be appreciated only by the few, have we not been somewhat hasty in concluding that a Gospel which attributes discourses of a recondite character to Christ has been evolved out of the author's own consciousness? May not the object of the fourth Gospel have been to rescue the higher elements in the Christian tradition, just as it is now being shown that the object of the Platonic writings was to conserve the more metaphysical elements in the teaching of Socrates?

But apart from this general admission by the Synoptists of a higher level in the teaching of Christ to which their informants had not always been able to attain, is it possible to find in the Synoptics anything like traces of the actual discourses embodied in the Fourth Gospel, by which their authenticity may be confirmed? Again I would venture to give an affirmative answer. Take the discourse in the sixth chapter which is looked upon as the most typically Johannine of all the discourses—an Alexandrian monologue appended to the Feeding of the Five Thousand, in which miracle the author has found a convenient peg to hang his own composition upon.[2] Why should we assume that it is only the *work* in this case that belongs to Christ, and that the *words* belong to another? We are told in Mark that when the multitude went into the wilderness with Christ, He taught them many things. What did He teach them? Was it only simple truths such as "God will pro-

[1] Luke viii. 10 R.V.

[2] Strauss says he "has applied the narrative of a miracle presented by tradition to the production of figurative discoures in the Alexandrian taste."—*Life of Jesus*, Geo. Eliot's Translation, p. 516.

vide." "God will give you the daily bread." "He who feeds the ravens will feed you too"? Did He never strike a deeper and more experimental note? Did He never use the earthly things as allegories of the heavenly? Assuredly He did. Though His early reporters did not understand these discourses sufficiently well to report them in full, they give undesigned testimony to their existence. Thus they report how on one occasion after the two miraculous feedings Christ said to His disciples, "Take heed and beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and Sadducees." And they reasoned among themselves, saying, "We took no bread." And Christ said to them, "How is it that ye do not perceive that I spake not to you concerning bread? But beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and Sadducees. Then understood they how that He bade them not beware of the leaven of bread, but of the teaching of the Pharisees and Sadducees." [1] We see, then, how on the testimony of the Synoptics Christ taught in connexion with the miracles of feeding a spiritual lesson, which was not fully grasped by His first followers. He spoke of a heavenly food which was in danger of being adulterated by the evil admixture of Pharisaism. Strong presumption is thus afforded by the Synoptics that the discourse in John on the "Bread from Heaven," though considerably modified by the Alexandrian dress in which it has been presented by the writer, proceeded in substance from the lips of Jesus.

Let us test in the same way another of the great discourses of John, that on the True Vine. Here again the occasion lent itself to elevated discourse. The Passover was a time when the head of the house spoke at length to the assembled company on the things believed among them. And we may be sure that Christ's intercourse with His disciples on that evening consisted of more than the

[1] Matt. xvi. 6–12 R.V.

words of Institution and the fragments of conversation reported in the Synoptics. Do the Synoptics themselves give any hint of more connected discourses, such as that on the Vine? Immediately there comes to mind Christ's saying following on the words of institution: "I say unto you, I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new with you in my Father's kingdom." [1] Here is the very argument of John xv., the union of Christ and His disciples in the Vine, of which the Father is the Husbandman, though in the hands of the Alexandrian interpreter the *new* vine becomes the *true* vine, which is the precise difference between the Hebrew and the Greek point of view, the one prophetic, the other philosophic.

But the most striking Synoptic parallel to the metaphysical side of John's Gospel is of course the great apostrophe of Matthew xi., which has always been a stumblingblock to those who wish to make a strict differentiation between the Synoptics and the Fourth Gospel. "I thank thee, O Father, Lord of Heaven and earth, that thou didst hide these things from the wise and understanding, and didst reveal them unto babes: yea, Father, for so it was well-pleasing in thy sight. All things have been delivered unto me of my Father: and no one knoweth the Son, save the Father; neither doth any know the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son willeth to reveal Him." [2] How awkward a corner this passage proves for those who hold the incompatibility of the Synoptic and the Johannine traditions is shown by the fact that such a writer as Schmiedel devotes several pages of his little book on the Johannine writings to an effort to evacuate the passage of its metaphysical content.[3] In its existing form,

[1] Matt. xxvi. 29 R.V. [2] Matt. xi. 25–27 R.V.
[3] *Die Johannes-schriften*, pp. 48–50.

Schmiedel admits, the passage has strong affinities with the Johannine point of view. But he adopts an emendation of the text, on the authority of the Apostolic Fathers, which gives an aorist instead of a present form to the verb, ἔγνω instead of ἐπιγινώσκει; and this to Schmiedel's mind changes the whole force of this saying of Jesus, so that it no longer affirms an eternal and suprasensible relation, but refers to a point of time—in the earthly history of Jesus—when this mutual knowledge of Father and Son began. It is questionable if the aorist will do all that he wishes for Schmiedel, and whether in this case it has not pretty much the same result as the present which stands in the Gospel MSS.[1] But no manipulation of tenses will alter the unique psychological effect of this passage. And the anxiety of Schmiedel to tone down its significance only serves to call attention to the fact that here, in the very midst of the Synoptic tradition, we have a pronouncement as genuinely transcendental as anything within the whole range of the Fourth Gospel. It is true, when we place it alongside similar passages in John, we see in the latter the difference due to the Alexandrian colouring which John gives to the higher teaching of Jesus. Let us take for example these words from the interview with Nicodemus, who was one of the wise and prudent who had to be born again and become as a babe ere he could enter the kingdom. "No man hath ascended into heaven, but he that descended out of heaven, even the Son of Man, which is in heaven."[2] These words contain virtually the same truth as Matthew xi. 27, though presented in a more Platonic style. We are not suggesting that the two discourses are identical. The context makes that impossible. But the discourse in Matthew xi. makes it possible to believe that such inter-

[1] See Burton, *New Testament Moods and Tenses*, p. 22.
[2] John iii. 13 R.V.

views as this of Christ with Nicodemus did actually take place, and are not the creations of a later disciple seeking to give a philosophical rendering of the Christian Faith.

This is the merest sketch of the way in which the line of argument recently adopted in the sphere of Socratic criticism may be applied to the Gospels. But I think sufficient has been said to show that the view which regards the discourses of Jesus in the Fourth Gospel as belonging to a genuine tradition, of which the writer was the depositary, so far from being debarred by the testimony of the Synoptics, is borne out not only by what is implied but by what is openly expressed in the earlier Gospels.

But a further observation remains. The undoubted presence of Greek influences in this Gospel does not necessarily involve that it was not written by a contemporary of Jesus, or at least by one who had personal access to the original sources. It must be remembered that the Greek element has entered through a Jewish medium, that of the Philonic literature, and does not prevent our final impression of the writer of the Gospel being of a Hebrew of the Hebrews. Even the much discussed prologue, which has sometimes been taken as emphatic evidence of the Greek affinities of the writer, only shows that he has chosen that part of the Philonic metaphysic which appealed most to his Jewish sympathies, because most consistent with old Testament tradition, to set in the forefront of his Gospel. In his recent articles in the Expositor Professor Rendel Harris has shown that the λόγος is just the Greek equivalent for the Wisdom or Creative Word of the Old Testament. It is quite evident that the author of the Gospel has modelled his prologue on the opening sentences in the story of Creation. We have only to place the opening verses of Genesis and those of John in parallel columns to

see that the latter could only have been written by a true disciple of the Jewish oracles.

Genesis i. 1–3, R.V.

In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth. And the earth was waste and void; and darkness was upon the face of the deep: and the spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters. And God said, Let there be light: and there was light.

John i. 1–5, R.V.

In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God. All things were made by him; and without him was not anything made that hath been made. In him was life; and the life was the light of men. And the light shineth in the darkness; and the darkness apprehended it not.

The affinity of the Prologue with the opening verses of Genesis will be apparent not only in subject-matter but in literary style. It is written in the same *oracular* vein, with short independent sentences. So great an authority as Bishop Lightfoot regards this one feature—which is characteristic not only of the prologue but of the whole Gospel—as sufficient to establish its Hebrew origin. In his now little known but profound and exhaustive essay on "The Gospel according to St. John: the Authenticity and Genuineness," he points out that classical writers distinguish two literary styles, the κατεστραμμένη or periodic and the εἰρομένη or jointed. The former is the style of Greek prose in its later period, the latter of the Hebrew Scriptures. The difference may be seen by comparing the prologue of Luke's Gospel, where the author is writing in his own native style, with that of John. To quote Lightfoot: "In fact, no greater contrast can be exhibited in this respect than the prologue of St. John when compared with the prologue of St. Luke. The sentences are strung together, where they are not altogether *asyndeta*. There is no attempt at periodicity. The καὶ takes the place of the ו, and has

almost as wide a range, connecting together not only independent, but dependent, and even opposite and contrasted clauses." [1]

On this then, as well as on other grounds, the Jewish antecedents of the author of the Fourth Gospel may be considered to be fairly well established. The question as to whether it is possible to relate him with the circle of the Twelve, or that larger circle who were frequent hearers of Christ, must be left for future consideration.

JOHN MACASKILL.

"OUT OF THE MOUTH OF BABES AND SUCKLINGS."

A SUGGESTION FOR PSALM VIII. 2, 3.

As preliminary to the discussion of this phrase, it will be well to take up the Psalm from the beginning. Verse 2*a* (Hebr.): "O Lord our Lord, how excellent is Thy name in all the earth," is identical with verse 10, and forms with it an envelope for the two strophes of the poem. This fact, generally recognised to-day, at once raises the first problem of the passage, in the word אֲשֶׁר which immediately follows. To retain this relative is to destroy the enveloping couplet, which has to stand by itself to fulfil its office. Further, the word following אֲשֶׁר, תְּנָה, is probably corrupt (yet see below), and any suggestion offered to clear up the verse must therefore deal with both words. The emendations that have been proposed fall into two classes, according as אֲשֶׁר is *modified* or *deleted*. Representative of the first class is that of Duhm, who reads, for the two words above, אַשִּׁירָה־נָּא, "I will sing now," a

[1] *Biblical Essays*, p. 131.

brilliant suggestion. Among the many of the second class, which deletes אֲשֶׁר as a gloss, that of Dr. Charles A. Briggs, in the *International Critical Commentary*, deserves especial mention, because he believes that the introductory couplet was followed by a *cohortative imperative*, and accordingly retains תְּנָה without change, as that form from the verb נָתַן in its common meaning of "set" or "place": "O set Thy glory," etc. In spite of Dr. Briggs' distinguished advocacy, however, this solution of the difficulties of the verse is not as generally acceptable with Old Testament scholars as one which, besides deleting אֲשֶׁר, so modifies תְּנָה as to yield a verb in the second person masculine singular perfect, to correspond to the verb in the next verse: "Thou hast established," etc. (The same objection applies also to Duhm's suggestion, given above.) Such a form would be, from the same verb, נָתַן, נתתָּ, and this reading, "Thou hast set," etc, is supported by the Syriac and Vulgate versions, and by the Targum. The present writer is more than content to adopt this reading, which has such good support, and has been accepted by so many eminent scholars, among them the lamented Dr. Francis Brown, in the Brown-Driver-Briggs edition of Gesenius. With these changes, verse 2 would then read:

"O-Jahweh our-Lord, . . .
How-excellent Thy-name in-all-the-earth!
Thou-hast-set Thy-glory above-the-heavens."

Here we have the enveloping couplet, and the first line of the first strophe of the poem. The measure is the three-beat, or trimeter, but the first line of the introductory couplet has but two beats, as in verse 10, probably to add dignity to the Divine name by the pause so given.

Coming now to verse 3, its first line, as the verse stands, is the phrase which called forth this discussion: "Out of the mouth of babes and sucklings." It is possible, of course,

to rearrange the clauses of verses 2 and 3, so as to bring a different order of lines in the couplets, and this is sometimes proposed, but there hardly seems enough gained in the sense to justify a proceeding necessarily so arbitrary. Accepting the present order as correct, we pass at once to the vital question for the whole passage: viz., What is the meaning of מִן here, and, bound up with this, the meaning of מִפִּי עוֹלְלִים וְיוֹנְקִים? Does the usual rendering: "Out of the mouth of babes and sucklings," suit, altogether, the general purpose of the poem? To get the full thought, the next clause should first be added to this one: "Hast thou established strength because of thine adversaries." The purpose of the poet, which controls the form as well as content of the Psalm, seems to be to set forth man's contrasted position in Jahweh's universe—his insignificance, in himself considered, in the first strophe, and his greatness, when viewed as Jahweh's vicegerent on earth, in the second. Now the usual translation does, indeed, emphasise man's insignificance, but offers no close connexion in thought with what precedes, the impressive first line of the strophe set off by the introductory couplet, a line which, as we have seen, in all probability originally read: "Thou hast set Thy glory above the heavens." ("Above" seems to be preferred by the authorities to "upon" for עַל in this phrase.) If, however, מִן be taken here in its connotation of separation, equally valid with that of source, we have a rendering of the whole verse which is not only in harmony with this preceding line, but also forecasts verse 4, and thus unifies the entire strophe. Before setting down the result of such a change, one further suggestion for the text may be made. As has been seen already, the lines of the poem are trimeter, and for this measure the phrase לְמַעַן צוֹרְרֶיךָ: "because of thine adversaries," as one beat, is awkwardly long. Might not the phrase be regarded as a later gloss,

and the line in which it occurs as having had but two beats originally, as has the first line of the enveloping couplet, or as having once been completed by some such form as לָךְ ? The point is not of any importance for our main contention, but such a supposition does no great violence to the text, while adding strength both to the form and content of the poem. With this further change, then, verses 2 and 3 would be :

"O-Jahweh our-Lord, . . .
How-excellent Thy-name in-all-the-earth !
Thou-hast-set Thy-glory above-the-heavens,
Away-from-the-mouth of-babes and-sucklings
Hast-Thou-established strength [for Thyself],
That-Thou-mightest-still the-enemy and-the avenger.

Verses 4 and 5, which complete the first strophe, go on :

"When I consider [Thy heavens] the work of Thy fingers,
The moon and the stars which Thou hast ordained,
What is man, that Thou art mindful of him,
And the Son of man, that Thou visitest him ?"

The changed force of מִן has unified the thought of the strophe about the heavens, first as rendering God's abode secure from the intrusion of His enemies, and secondly as furnishing the supreme evidence of His power in nature and of man's contrasted weakness. It has also reinforced greatly, in both parts, the controlling idea of this first strophe, man's insignificance, and that in a way far more compelling than the usual rendering suggests.

It remains, now, for us to support such a use of מִן from other Old Testament passages, and to defend the derogatory meaning therewith required for the rest of the phrase : "the mouth of babes and sucklings."

The clearest example of מִן in this use is found in Genesis xxvii. 39, in the (negative) blessing upon Esau, where it occurs twice. The aged Isaac has been deceived into pronouncing the irrevocable blessing of the dying father

upon Jacob, and there is nothing left for heart-broken Esau but the converse. Hence the whole point of the passage lies in reading the מִן of separation (E.R.V., A.R.V. margin): "*Away from* the fatness of the earth shall be thy dwelling, And *away from* the dew of heaven from above, And by thy sword shalt thou live, And thou shalt serve thy brother," etc. Another passage is Proverbs xx. 3: "It is an honour to a man to *keep aloof from* strife" (E.R.V., A.R.V.), or (Brown-Driver-Briggs Lex.) "to *sit away from*," where the idea of separation in מִן is inevitable. Still another example, and one very suggestive for the contention of this paper, is Nahum iii. 11. It is true that both E.R.V. and A.R.V. take מִן here as causal, "because of," and this is, of course, entirely possible, yet their margin reads "a defence *against*," and the context would seem to make "*away from*" at least equally in point. The verse is in the famous parallel which the prophet draws between the once all-powerful Thebes and the equally doomed Nineveh: "Thou also shalt be drunken; thou shalt be hid; thou also shalt seek a stronghold away from the enemy." Especially significant for our study is the occurrence of the word "stronghold," מָעוֹז, in this precise connexion, since the kindred word עֹז is found following "babes and sucklings" here in our Psalm, though usually translated "strength," as E.R.V. and A.R.V. However, several distinguished Old Testament scholars, among them Ewald, Delitzsch, Hupfeld, Cheyne, Driver and Duhm, think that עֹז is for מָעוֹז, and translate "stronghold." The parallel between: "Thou also shalt seek a stronghold away from the enemy," and: "Away from the mouth of babes and sucklings, Thou hast established a stronghold [for Thyself]. To still the enemy and the avenger" is certainly notable, even if we do not follow Duhm in thinking that "the enemy and the avenger" had

been originally applied to supernatural enemies, and later lost its mythological tinge. This last is a characteristically fascinating suggestion, and it may well be that the Hebrew conception of the universe, where the abode of Jahweh is placed high above the firmament, the beams of His palace going down through the upper waters to rest upon its solid surface (cf. Ps. civ. 3), traces back ultimately to some such mythological beginning. The parallels between Genesis i. and the Babylonian Epic of Creation support this, and it would doubtless strengthen our case for the מִן of separation here; but even without going so far it does not seem too much to say that this Nahum passage throws a strong side-light on our Psalm, and appreciably strengthens the probability of מִן having the meaning there for which we contend.

But it is, of course, not enough simply to establish the occurrence of this use of מִן in the Old Testament, and its pertinence in this passage. If this interpretation of the preposition should be found to involve an impossible, or even a very unlikely meaning for "mouth," or for "babes and sucklings," this would tell heavily against it. A study of these words must, therefore, be included in this discussion. We remark first of all, that a *metaphorical* use of these terms *must be assumed* by all who do not think they refer to the actual voices of children, raised in praise of some kind. This latter interpretation, of which further mention will soon be made, would of course render the contention of the writer void, but setting that aside, it becomes simply a question of one metaphorical use against another. The meaning then of "mouth" and of "babes and sucklings" required by our interpretation of מִן is: persons hostile to Jahweh and His rule of the world, or at least scornful and contemptuous of Him, who are at the same time utterly impotent against Him, as the poet clearly sees.

That the word "mouth," פֶּה, is used in the Old Testament of hostile or contemptuous speech may be seen from such a passage as Psalm xxxv. 21: "Yea they opened their mouth wide against me; They said, Aha, aha, our eye hath seen it"; or, Psalm lxxiii. 8, 9, of the wicked: "They scoff, and in wickedness utter oppression: They speak loftily. They have set *their mouth* in" [or "against," בְּ] "the heavens, And their tongue walketh through the earth." "*Against* the heavens" (so R.V. margin) would be very suggestive for our Psalm, since "heavens" probably refers to the abode of God. Finally, Isaiah lvii. 4 may be cited: "Against whom do ye sport yourselves, Against whom make ye a *wide mouth*, and put out the tongue?" These passages surely suffice to establish the possibility that our phrase: "The mouth of babes and sucklings," at least as far as the term "mouth" goes, may just as well convey an attitude of hostility as one of worship. But what of "babes and sucklings"? Here indeed is the reef on which the ship of our interpretation will perchance be wrecked! This phrase occurs five times in the Old Testament, aside from our passage, viz., Isaiah xv. 3 and xxii. 19; Jeremiah xliv. 7; Lamentation ii. 11 and Joel ii. 16. Examination proves that in every one of these cases "babes and sucklings" has a strictly literal meaning, referring to very young children. This is an impressive fact. Does it logically involve the taking of the phrase literally in our Psalm also, and "mouth," preceding, likewise? This interpretation was mentioned above, but its real strength can be more fully appreciated now. Moreover, the New Testament use of our passage, i.e. in Matthew xxi. 15, 16, supports it: "But when the chief priests and the scribes saw the wonderful things that He did, and *the children crying* in the temple and saying: Hosanna to the Son of David; they were moved with

indignation, and said unto Him, Hearest Thou what these are saying? And Jesus saith unto them, Yea: did ye never read, '*Out of the mouth of babes and sucklings* thou hast perfected praise'? " It may, indeed, be that something in the circumstances when the Psalm was first sung would, if known, attest this the true purpose of it, to serve as a children's hymn for some occasion, but that is only a speculation, after all, and we have to do with a well attested Hebrew text in the critical word " strength," or " fortress," which follows " babes and sucklings." For the strength of the New Testament witness lies largely in the *αἶνον*, "praise," which it draws from the reading of the Séptuagint: " Out of the mouth of babes and sucklings Thou hast perfected praise." The Septuagint is supported here, it is true, by the Vulgate and Syriac Versions, and by the Targum, but there appears to be no corruption in the Hebrew, as there was in verse 2, to *compel* us to reject עֹז, and follow them. We can *elect* to follow the Greek, of course, when this whole discussion becomes at once superfluous; but if we hold to the Hebrew, reading " strength " or " fortress " instead of " *praise*," then, while the literal meaning of " babes and sucklings " is not by any means excluded (cf. e.g., Dr. C. A. Briggs), still the metaphorical seems better, on the whole. And, as between different metaphorical interpretations, since there are no other cases to guide us, the writer cannot see why there may not be here a more or less satirical reference to the scornful scepticism of those who deny Jahweh's control of human affairs, just as probably as a mere figure for man's insignificance, which is the usual explanation. Certainly such scoffers appear in the Old Testament as early as Isaiah's time, and we find them again in Zephaniah's day, while they figure quite largely in the Proverbs and the Psalms (cf. the quotations above). The poet clearly intends to

convey their impotence, as well as their venom, in his lines:

> "Thou hast set Thy glory above the heavens,
> Away from the mouth of babes and sucklings;
> Thou hast established a fortress [for Thyself],
> That Thou mightest still the enemy and the avenger."

The parallelism is alternating in character, the first line corresponding to the third, and the second to the fourth, and thus "the enemy and the avenger" are shown to be only "babes and sucklings," after all.

Howell Merriman Haydn.

THE MYSTERY OF CHRIST.

"THE mystery of Christ" to the thinking of the present age is nothing more and also nothing less than the mystery of personality upraised to the highest pitch of power and achievement. To the thinking of the first age in which, of course, the phrase and its philosophy arose, it was that also, but from its own so different point of view. In spite of limitations now easily observed the first age was able to discern and aptly to define the personality that captivated and convinced it, and ever since has captivated and convinced the ages. The question now is as to the definition which it behoves the present age to offer, standing, as it does, before the self-same personality, but in a world of thought and imagination far removed indeed from that in which the earliest attempt at definition sprang. Far removed and yet related as one stage of a process is related to another, and also because the creative personality itself is of yesterday and to-day alike. No doubt the personality of Christ belongs profoundly to "the fulness of the time" and must needs be sifted out and known as far as may be in connexion with the same—the knowledge must be historical or it is naught—but it belongs profoundly to "the time now present" and is capable of definition by its thought as of imitation and assimilation in its life.

If, as one might show, there is nothing in the world we know and need, which does not find its goal or soul in personality, there is nothing in personality again which does not find its ground or good in a creative personality like Christ. In Christ the common heritage of personality burst into a form admittedly of elemental mould and

make. It could not be hid at the first or ever thereafter. One might say that it suggests the soaring of the Gothic arch inwrought of truth and loveliness; or that it is full of the rhythm and the life of all great art. One thing is certain, that it has that character of the elemental or creative which is common to the greatest art and the greatest life, and which is always truth as well as beauty, form as well as fact. Hence it is not to be described as supernatural so much as just supremely natural, the supremely natural being that which is nearest to the nature of the whole to which it belongs.

In the first age, the theory of pre-existence was used extensively to account for the personality of Christ appearing in the fields of time, but in the thought of our age the theory has simply merged in the larger one of personality human and divine. What the earlier theory laboured to define the later does not contradict, but only labours to define afresh. Pre-existence was but a mode of stating a unique relationship, the sense of the transcendent meaning of the person and his worth to God and man. It was worth and meaning such as passed the bounds of time and were centred in the world beyond. There the person had his real being and abode, and thence he came, self-emptied of his own, as one has put it in a famous phrase, and in fashion as a man. But even in the form of man there was such an affinity with God, a consciousness of God so piercing and profound, that nothing could avail to express it—or explain—save the idea of pre-existence. The idea was speedily forced into the service of the facts by the facts themselves. There was that in them which found itself in it, and there was that in it which lent itself to them. It was not the only idea nor the first which lent itself to the facts, but the more the facts were scrutinised the more it seemed to offer them an appropriate form. It was already

firmly set in the doctrine of the age. Both in Palestine and Greece it was inwoven with the view of God prevailing in the olden time which severed Him so far and widely from the world, that to bring Him into contact with the world it had to interpose the agency of other powers and of one at length supreme among them all who could in some sense unify the twain. It tells of some inner bond betwixt things remote, the trend towards unity within the whole, that types of thought so diverse as the Greek and Jewish, pursuing lines essentially their own, should flow together at the last and mould the thought of future years. For " it was not the case, as is sometimes represented, that Western was overpowered by Eastern thought. Each found something in the other to help its progress in the direction in which it was naturally developing, but we cannot say that either was warped from its natural tendencies by a foreign influence. Hence each may be explained from its own history."

But the point of interest for us is that the two lines of development with histories so definitely their own met together in Philo, a contemporary of Christ, and " the value of his philosophy lies in this, that it constitutes another step in the evolution of the idealistic tendencies that underlay Greek thought from the time of Anaxagoras and which the Stoics vainly endeavoured to escape. And this step had a higher significance, because it was partly the result of a similar movement in Jewish religion and showed that the Eastern was involved in similar difficulties with the Western mind. For the first time in the history of the world these two great streams of thought had run together and a beginning was made in that process of fusion of which the whole development of Christian theology was the outcome." [1]

[1] See Edward Caird, *The Evolution of Theology in the Greek Philosophers*, vol. ii. 182, 202–3.

Now, in a process both so wide and so one as this, it is possible to trace the *præparatio evangelica*, and, as implied therein, the one-ness of the system whence the Christian principle arose as a new and further revelation of itself. For Christianity rightly understood, understood, that is, in relation to history, is no kind of irruption from without, but rather an emergence or expansion from within, in which the whole economy of life and thought breaks into a fresh and fuller phase of its becoming. It is not possible to separate the phases of a vast becoming, they are entwined and essential each to each as in any living thing, and one might say, therefore, that the contribution which the ancient world was able to bring to the problem of the ages, itself a part of the becoming, consisted broadly in these two ideas: first, the idea of an impassable or an almost impassable gulf betwixt God and man; and, second, the idea of a being great enough to cross the gulf, himself partaking of the life of both. These ideas were like feelers stretching out to the time about to come, like hands pointing to the unknown future. It seems thoroughly in vain to account for Christianity or the forms which it assumed in the first formative period of its life without trying to appreciate the long pre-Christian growth of thought in West and East alike. What if that growth had got the length, mainly, of a dualism, yet it was a dualism greater than it knew, fraught with the promise of a future which is even now in course of being fulfilled.

The point for us here is this, it tells of the extraordinary hold which Jesus took of the life and thinking of His age that the terms or titles which were freely ascribed to this supreme creation or imagination of the ancient world, the mediator standing between the distant heavens and the earth, the daysman of the Deity and man, should be ascribed to Jesus as all in keeping with His character and

cause. And it is our task now to trace as far as it is possible in the New Testament the line of thought by which the men of the first age came to apply those titles to the personality of Jesus, or to what one of them described as the mystery of Christ. In justice both to them and to the object of their thought, we must think ourselves back as best we may into the world in which they lived, a world remote from our own and yet profoundly akin to it in virtue of the object which is just as central to our world as it was to theirs. The object is as central and in a sense the same, but the general cast of thought has so greatly altered through the years that one may doubt indeed whether it be possible ever to return in thought to the thinking of the primitive time. In any case one can only return to criticise and reconstruct.

Thus the idea of pre-existence which was so fundamental to the ancient world, in the view of the modern but dimly shadows forth the sense or source of personality. Personality is the point, as one may say, at which the mystery of the universe begins to be conscious of itself and of the law and order that are native to its life. If personality has thus within it, so to speak, the open secret of the whole, what is to prevent it disclosing or discovering itself in a novel and creative form like that of Jesus Christ ? Given a concept of personality wide enough to include the manifold of life without and within, nature, man and God, and there is room in it for the elemental type of the Nazarene. The newness of a Jesus from the modern point of view does not need or lead to any theory of pre-existence to explain it, but only the comprehensive principle of personality. Personality as a principle or form of thought has come to have a range that far outstrips the dualism of the past, and its notion of a being filling up the void between the finite and the infinite, eternity and time. And it is only

when we grasp the length and breadth of personality that we can return with sympathy to the primitive point of view and see how in striving to interpret Jesus as it did it was saying all it could say about His mystery. It was bringing the last word of the faith and reason of the ages to make Him known.

Now one can point to no other figure in the course of history that won such an incomparable place within the thought and faith of men, and this, instead of detracting from the historic fact of Jesus, surely adds to it, and serves to fix it the more deeply in the soil of time. It surely reinforces, as it were, His historicity, lays an emphasis upon it, that men, in order to appraise His life and death, were impelled to speak in language springing from the heights of current doctrine and belief. If a fact is such that in stating it as truly as they can, men have to drop the usual modes of speech and adopt another pertaining to divinity itself, there is witness borne to the extraordinary nature of the fact. It shows that the fact has cleft its way right home to the life of the time and is kindred to its aspirations and its "rarest dreams." What if in trying to express it the early thinkers idealised it, was not that just a part of the attempt to interpret and relate it? The idealisation is not mere phantasy but the unfolding of the fulness of the fact itself. It is not apart from the fact or something merely brought to it from without, but rather the fact itself in its own self-expansion, clothing itself in form in keeping with itself. It is a part of the process of realisation—a process which is still at work.

For it is the fact, the same dynamic fact so finely sensed in the New Testament, that concerns us now, and if we are not able any longer to adopt the form or forms peculiar to the prime, it is because the fact in realising itself has grown beyond them, and is seeking other forms adapted

to its endless life. The main thing for us is the fact, the appreciation of the supreme historic fact, or figure, in and under all the forms in which it may be found with a view to that larger appreciation and presentment of the same which the modern world requires. What must be the nature of a fact that at the first and all the ages through drew to itself the highest current formulae of thought, and to-day is still attracting the last constructive effort of the modern mind? If there is one problem that confronts us now, it is that of reinterpreting this vital fact, creating a portrait of Jesus such as we find in the New Testament, and yet in colours that are true or in language that is known to the spirit of the time. To reproduce the matchless image of the Gospels and make it speak, as of old, to the life and labours of the present, is the function in especial of the Christian Church. Not an active mind within its pale but may add some touch or feature helping out the whole.

It is our task, then, as fully and as fairly as we can, and with every kind of aid available to think back into the first Christian age and into the first results of thought upon the mystery of Christ. It was only gradually, as one can see, that the extraordinary nature of the fact arose upon the first interpreters and took possession of their minds. There are only fragments, after all, of reminiscence and reflection in the Gospels as they stand, scarcely more at times than syllables or whispers of the same, but these are fraught with something that is inexhaustible, the ages turning unfilled to them again; wherein lies the proof of the greatness of the fact as well as of the inspired perception of its witnesses. The wonder is that the evangelists were able to collect and correlate not so little but so much of what was new to them and past their telling—"the inexplorable wealth of the Christ," and so much also of what has proved

to be as a fount of life to men in every age. It is not the meagreness of the Gospels or their contradictions and defects that first or last impress the mind, however much the critic loves to point them out, but a certain flavour of poetic fulness all their own, a certain affluence of suggestion which is there as in the immortal things of art, the presence of an element of vision and of nearness to reality itself. Much of the world's greatest art is small in bulk but rich in beauty, and the test of art is never bulk but beauty. And tried by a test like this the Gospels stand alone in the thing they say and the way they say it on every page. If one is ever to arrive at the world of wonder and of life in which they move, one must approach them with something of the eye and the spirit that produced them. One must get there first if one is to transfer their treasures to the world in which we live. To this end the critical attitude is indispensable, but of itself is not enough, save as it springs from and issues in one that is constructive through and through. Criticism is but the process of the pruning of the branch that beareth fruit that it may bear more fruit. More fruit, not less or none at all, is the purpose and the end of all constructive criticism.

Now it is one of the fruits of criticism both that there is a process of reflection in the Gospels and the New Testament as a whole upon the fact of Jesus and that the process began before the mind of Paul had any share in it at all. That it began in advance of Paul and reached a point as vital to his thought as to that of the primitive community itself may not as yet be generally allowed. For criticism has often made and makes it appear as if Paul and his scheme of thought were independent of the original community, and had started up *de novo* and as a thing apart. It has maintained indeed that Paul is the second founder of

Christianity: that the theology of the New Testament, being a theology of redemption first and last, is mainly due to his creative mind. But in this result criticism has somewhat failed to perceive, or at least to reckon with, a certain element of doctrine, what one might truly describe as the nucleus of the Pauline thought itself, as already there, and there supremely, in the preaching and the praxis of his predecessors; that what was central in his belief was central from the first in theirs alike. Not a few contend that a larger place must now be allowed for the influence of this primitive theology. They do not say, of course, that in passing through the mind of Paul it was not vastly altered and enriched, but only that it belongs to the soil and substance of his thought which is incomprehensible without it.

It is not saying too much, in other words, that the main content of the Christian faith is one and the same for Paul as for Peter and the first apostles. There is ground indeed for holding that Peter rather than Paul is the second founder of Christianity in the sense at least that in "turning again" he turned to the innermost shrine of the gospel, to "the first article of the Christian creed," the doctrine that "Jesus is the Christ" and "Christ" in the Christian sense. The evidence consists of an indication here and an allusion there on the part of Paul himself, and is enough to show that the doctrine did not originate with him, but was "received" by him as belonging to the gospel which he preached, the gospel which, as he recognised, was common to them both. However much it grew betimes and was transformed within his teeming brain it was really the living fact or force of it which from the first incited him to persecute and then to preach. The crusade of the Pharisee was born in a sense of the same insight as the "conversion" of the Christian. It was because he saw

in his victims, in Stephen's angel face, that the righteousness of law was "frustrated" by a righteousness apart from law, the righteousness of God which is through faith in Jesus Christ, that he threw himself upon them with "threatening and slaughter." It was because he saw in a flash the other side of the same truth, that the righteousness of grace availed where the righteousness of law had failed, that he turned to it with all the longing of his heart and mind. "If righteousness is through law: then Christ died for nought." "Ye are nought as regards Christ, ye are entirely separated from him, ye who would be justified by law; ye are fallen away from grace" (Gal. ii. 21, v. 4.)

From all of which it appears that it is the doctrine of grace that was at first the provocation and then at length the inspiration, at first the "goad" of the persecutor and then the guide of the apostle. It was the truth of the gospel, the dynamic truth, which, as both his history and preaching prove, was not original to him, but original rather to the man who "turned again and strengthened the brethren." To Paul at least the turning of Peter was an admission of the fact that a man is not justified by the works of law but only through faith in Jesus Christ; and even if the admission on his part did not carry all, or nearly all, that it implied to the larger mind of Paul, still it was his to begin with; his first of all, to effect, or rather to experience, the transition from the Christ of the Jewish hope to the Christ of the Christian creed. It was not at Caesarea Philippi, where he is reported to have said, "Thou art the Christ," that he experienced the transition, nor there surely that he found the secret of Christ in the Christian sense or was entitled to the great ascription "thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church," etc. For as the stern rebuke administered and the novel teaching prove (Mark viii. 31–34), the disciple there had only

reached a stage upon the long and arduous path of spiritual truth, and there was many another stage to pass,

"O'er moor and fen, o'er crag and torrent,"

till his humbled spirit was exalted to discern the mystery of the Kingdom and the Christ. For him, as for the rest, there was the tremendous ascent to achieve from Jewish Messianism to Christian Christology: or from the ethics and religion of law to the ethics and religion of grace. It was nothing less indeed than the creative ascent from law to grace, from Moses to Christ in the Christian sense—the supreme experience which, as Paul explains, was the experience of others before himself, and the mystery of the gospel which he began by assailing and ended by proclaiming in its magnitude of grace and truth. Hence Peter and Paul are really unanimous in their belief in Jesus as the Christ, and of their Christology the fountain head is Christ Himself.

As the author in 1 Peter v. 12 expressly states, his aim in writing is "to testify that this is what the true grace of God means," and if such is the aim of his writing, it is even more its atmosphere and the atmosphere too that belongs to the primitive Church and is the most novel thing about it. For an atmosphere is something more than an aim that is expressed in words however true, and in the New Testament from beginning to end there is nothing more distinctive than the atmosphere enfolding it in every part and making it profoundly one amid its difference. One might say perhaps that the study of the New Testament is more a study in the subtleties of atmosphere than in the significance of words. Those at least who hold that atmosphere is an element that pertains to literature as truly as to art can no more doubt the presence of it in the New Testament and the extraordinary newness of it there, than they can doubt the newness, say, of the Gothic style of architecture as contrasted with the Romanesque from

which it sprang. Not only the aim but the whole atmosphere of Gothic is charged with a new-born principle of life unknown to the other. "Of all events in the history of architecture the transition from Romanesque to Gothic is incomparably the most striking and dramatic." And something similar might be said of the transition from the Old Testament to the New. The aim is different, but more different is the atmosphere that flows through all its thought and utterance. It is the witness, chiefly, of its newness as a whole.

But even if some may not admit the place of atmosphere to this extent, they must admit that the words of the New Testament are instinct with a spirit, and fraught with a truth that must be felt as well as known, breathed in as well as thought out. Deissmann says that "in the religiously creative period which came first of all the power of Christianity to form *new* words was not nearly so large as its effect in *transforming* the meaning of the old words." The transformation of meaning sprang, of course, from a transformation of life or of atmosphere just as the transformation of Gothic did; and the point for us here is that the primitive Church as a whole partook of the transformation. It was this that thrust it into being and made it an Ecclesia at all; this that from the first explains community and creed alike. Hence when Paul became a member of the Church it was a Church already throbbing with a life and quick with an air of exultation peculiarly its own, in no way due to him or his authority, but due to revelation from above working through the creative personality of Jesus upon the faith and reason of the man who first of all confessed him in the Christian sense. "Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-Jonah: for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven." Surely it was in virtue of the revelation given and received not merely

at Caesarea Philippi, but mainly at the moment when he turned again, that Peter was hailed as "this rock" upon which "I will build my church." The point before us is that the Church, as the offspring both of revelation and of faith, was already there in its reality, with its appointed "Lord and Christ" and its new creative creed or principle or power of grace, ere ever Paul began to persecute or preach at all. And we may say that but for it and its dynamic "dipped in blood" Paul had never chanced to play the rôle of foeman or of friend at all.

It is possible, then, for critical reasons to believe that it fell to Peter first among men and not to Paul to seize the truth concerning Jesus as the Christ in Jesus' sense, that, in other words, it was his first, after many days, in regard to the Christ to take "God's view of things and not man's." Paul is not speaking for himself alone, but for all the bearers of the gospel message, most of all for those who had been "apostles before him," when he declares, "We (of the ministry of the new covenant) henceforth know no man after the flesh; yea though (as Jews) we have known a Christ after the flesh (i.e. in Markan phrase, a Christ "after the things of men"), yet now would we know (such a Messiah) no more."[1] He is referring to the great ascent from "Jewish messianism" to "Christian Christology," and clearly he does not make it begin with himself. Rather he, like them, has attained to the secret of Christhood, the eternal secret now at length revealed to the Christian Church. He and they are one in their ascent to and acceptance of the Christ of God.

Now this is what Paul, with a far wider grasp than they of all it means, attempts to express in the frequent phrase "the mystery of Christ." Mystery in this connexion is one of the words especially that underwent inevitable

[1] See B. W. Bacon, *Jesus the Son of God*, pp. 98–99.

change. To hold the newness of the new ideal, it had to expand into something new itself. From denoting a secret that *must* be concealed, it came to denote a secret that has been revealed. In this sense it is mostly found in league with words of revelation, as though revelation were now essential to a secret, and it stands pre-eminently for the secret of God which has now been revealed in the universal Christ—the Christ alike of Jew and Greek—and which it is the function of those who are its "stewards" to declare to all who have ears to hear. Paul may haply have found the word, as he found so much besides, in the Greek world of his adoption; "the word was everywhere current in the Greek religious world"; but he could have found it nearer to his hand in the Jewish world of his birth. If he was debtor to each, he was more of a debtor to the one than to the other. The roots of both his being and belief unquestionably were fixed in native soil. Far as he fared in other lands and deep as he drank of other streams of life and thought, yet it was always as one who had tasted of the living waters of Jerusalem. One can always overhear the ancient cry upon his lips, "If I forget thee, O Jerusalem." It was from thence he drew his genius for religion, and his imperious zeal for God and righteousness, and as for the cast or fashion of his piety, ethical and mystic both, it is surely most of all akin to that of the Old Testament itself. There is a strain of mysticism in the Old Testament and in allied products of Rabbinic thought which is too often ignored in the critical report of Jewish legalism. It is vital both to Paul and to his spiritual ancestry. In view of all this, it is no doubt true to say that "the word, with its correlative 'revelation,' was at hand in the region of the Apostle's own Jewish training, and we need not seek a heathen origin for his use of it."[1] At the same time, one so mentally

[1] See J. Armitage Robinson, *St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians*, p. 31.

alive and quick as Paul would be drawn to a word which he must have met elsewhere, a word of more than usual significance and which would therefore serve as a kind of link betwixt the worlds that mingled in his mind and ministry. The word was there in both awaiting, as it were, the infusion of a larger truth. The point here is that Paul, whether he took the word from Jew or Greek or both, was able in the fullest sense to make the infusion, turning it to the service of his thought, and his thought is one substantially with the thought of the primitive Church itself.

Thus in Mark iv. 11 it is reported that Jesus, being asked for the parables by those who were about him with the Twelve, said, "To you the mystery of the Kingdom of God is committed: but to those outside it all comes in parables," where mystery stands, as in the language of the Apostle, for a secret that is not to be concealed but revealed to all who have it in them to believe. If the notion of "something kept secret" always belongs to the term, that is surely mainly in the sense which the passage implies, that the revealing depends upon a certain aptitude or interest on the hearer's part. The hearer always has his part in the imparting of the truth. Thus in the parallel in Matthew, as part of Jesus' answer there occurs a saying which is found elsewhere emphasising the condition under which the revelation can be made. "For whosoever hath, to him shall be given, and he shall have abundance; but whosoever hath not, from him shall be taken away, even that which he hath." No doubt the saying belongs to another context and is inserted here, but it helps to elucidate a principle pertaining to the parables and the person both, the principle, viz., that to those who are insensitive, pre-occupied, "outside," the mystery of the Kingdom or the mystery of the Christ remains a mystery, the very means of showing,

shrouding it, while to those who are sensitive, sympathetic, "of the truth," it is free and open as the light. And it is surely just this vital principle, reaching far and wide as it does, that finds expression in the words, otherwise so hard to understand, recorded by Mark, beginning, "*That* seeing they may see and not perceive," and in those by Matthew beginning, "*Because* seeing they see not." In the use of parable it was not Jesus' purpose to perplex or punish, but always to illuminate and charm, but, as experience proved, His purpose hung upon another factor, the responsiveness or not of men, and, like the prophet long before Him, Jesus had to meet an irresponsiveness which foiled the truth and turned its blessing into woe.

That this was not the aim of Jesus' parables, whatever their result might often be, is clearly shown by the statement at the end of the passage in Mark. "And in many such parables did He speak the word to them, as they were able to hear it; but without a parable He did not speak to them. And in private He explained everything to His own disciples. "As they were able to hear it" is a luminous touch which seems to hold the truth about the parables, that they were meant in every case to teach, but just so much as every hearer had it in him to acquire—more or less according to the "means embraced." For

> "The means that heaven yields must be embraced,
> And not neglected."

There is nothing in the passage in whole or in part that seems to be at variance with this law.

At the same time not a few deny that Jesus ever spoke those words about the mystery of the Kingdom, for the reason that "an esoteric teaching was wholly alien to the historic Jesus." Now what is usually understood by esoteric teaching—teaching granted to the few but guarded from the many—was alien to Jesus, but no such thing,

we are persuaded, is suggested in the phrase before us. In a saying which appears in Mark and elsewhere in other connexions, Jesus strongly disclaims the idea of anything being hid or made secret in order to remain as such. "For there is nothing hidden except that it should come to light, nor is anything made a secret except that it might come into the open." Clearly, then, a teaching with such a motive in its heart, to which, no doubt, conditions are attached, but conditions all of a piece with the teaching itself, is no more esoteric than is the beauty that depends upon the virtue of the seeing eye or the hearing ear. It is not easy to understand why the thought that more could be revealed to some than to others should be considered unworthy of Jesus,[1] when it is actually true to life itself. It was inevitable indeed that teaching so intense and personal as His, with its appeal to, or rather its assault upon the soul, should excite the most dissimilar response, in some, one of interest and attraction growing into faith, in others, one of stiffness and resentment ending in offence. Even among those who were minded to believe, the disciples themselves, there was often a dulness, often an absence of the needed insight as among those "without." They failed at the time to pierce the parabolic veil and catch the principle involved. But this was not because there was anything esoteric in the teaching, but only because being full of spiritual depth and daring it called for a further growth or effort of the spirit in them.

Thus on one momentous day He said to His disciples, "Let these words sink into your ears: for the Son of Man shall be delivered up into the hands of men. But they understood not this saying, and it was concealed from them, that they should not perceive it" (Luke ix. 44–5). But this was only for the time in hand, inasmuch as it was truth that

[1] See Montefiore, *The Synoptic Gospels*, vol. i. p. 123.

was new and strange to them, and was not easily adjusted all at once. It was but gradually, and step by step as it were, that even His disciples came to master what He meant as well as who He was. It was natural that as in His person so in His word, there should be something deeply interfused that was difficult to understand and that could only yield its secret to the seeking mind. "He that hath to him shall be given." A word like His which concerned the mind or life profoundly could not but require an attitude more or less attuned to it. That Jesus was aware of there being more in what he said than met the ear is shewn by the frequency with which he used the insistent phrase: "He that hath ears, let him hear." But again there is nought of the esoteric here, and nought but the mystery of reason whose nature is to be revealed.

May we not say then that "mystery" in the novel setting of the gospel is transformed and instead of being something dark which it is impious to disclose, it is lightsome like the thought of God and must needs disclose itself to every kindred mind, to every heart,

"That watches and receives."

In a word, the soul or sense of mystery is not darkness but light, the open and not the obscure.

There are two kinds of mystery, as one may say. There is one mystery of the night and another mystery of the light, but that of the light is more of a mystery than that of the night. Here is an object, and it lies beneath "the dragon wing of night," without shape or hue so far as we can see or aught to make it known, and we say, "How mysterious!" But let night withdraw its wing and the object pass into the light, and how much more of a mystery it is now that it is seen in all its wealth of colour and of form, and as it stands related to the mighty world around. So it is not when a jewel is hidden and opaque that one is

conscious of its mystery, but when it starts to flash and glitter in the sun and when the tints concealed within its heart come floating up as from some endless fount of light. There is no end to what an object—any world-object—has to tell about itself when once it is seen into and set in its appointed place within the whole. Not one of the sciences of Nature, e.g., but has been occupied in sweeping cloud and darkness from the thoughts of men about the world, but not one has swept away aught of its vital mystery from the world itself. Rather, in opening up far-stretching spheres of life and law the sciences have enlarged the eye and prospect of the mind and therewithal the infinite wonder of the universe. In scattering the mystery of darkness, they have extended the mystery of light. Their task is nothing less than to transform the mystery of darkness into the mystery of light; of chaos into that of cosmos far and near. On one occasion when a certain astronomer was scanning a cloudless sky, Sirius in all its glory shot into the field of his telescope and the extraordinary beauty of the vision gave him such a shock of pain that, we are told, he "was obliged to close his eyes to prevent his fainting." More beauty, more law and order, method, meaning, mystery, such is the nature of the world that opens out before the unresting gaze of men. One may perhaps recall in this connexion, as another illustration of the same, that in "The Dream of Gerontius" the disembodied spirit, darting from the angel's hold in the utter impulse of its love, presses onwards to the "awful Throne" where, consumed yet quickened by the glance of God, it cries,

> "Take me away, and in the lowest deep
> There let me be.
> . . . . . .
> Take me away,

That sooner I may rise and go above
And see Him in the truth of everlasting day."

For as yet its faculties, developed though they were, could not endure the fulness of the beatific light. And such is the nature of the spirit of man whose reach exceeds its grasp, but whose grasp is all prophetic of a reach that can only rest in the ultimate mystery of the Divine.

The principle in regard to all such things is that the more light brings the more mystery. The more that nature is seen and human nature known the farther they lead into the region of divinity. Mystery is essentially the element or atmosphere in which divinity abides. One of the greatest of modern craftsmen has truly said that "mystery is like a kind of atmosphere which bathes the greatest works of the masters; every great work has this quality of mystery." If there is mystery about the work of the masters, how much more about all that we call divine. Yet not the mystery of darkness, but the mystery of light. "Thou coverest Thyself with light as with a garment." "God is light and in Him is no darkness at all." But that does not mean in Him is no mystery at all. Time was when men thought of God as a mystery of darkness, now we think of God as a mystery of light. Once He was mysterious because He concealed Himself; now He is mysterious because He reveals Himself. Revelation is not the negation of mystery, but the transformation of the mystery of darkness into the mystery of light.

"My God, how wonderful Thou art,
Thy majesty how bright,
How beautiful Thy mercy-seat
In depths of burning light!"

Revelation is not and never is the dispersion of these depths of light, but the disclosure of them, depth after depth, as men are able to receive them. It is just what St. John

with matchless insight says about the Word become flesh, "for of his fulness we all received, and grace for grace," i.e., grace after grace, grace succeeding grace, like wave succeeding wave, perpetually. And this might be said to be but another aspect of the saying, "He that hath, to him shall be added." Wordsworth tells of a man who would gaze

> "On the more distant scene,—how lovely 'tis
> Thou see'st,—and he would gaze till it became
> Far lovelier, and his heart could not contain
> The beauty, still more beauteous!"

Just as beauty to the seeing eye is still more beauteous, so to him that hath, the truth is still more true, and grace is still more gracious. And all this applies to revelation, which embraces beauty, truth and grace, and which might be said to be a process in which there are at once more disclosure and more depth to disclose; more unfolding and more fulness to unfold; more wonder, more worship; more meaning, more mystery. Revelation is such, in other words, that mystery is always passing into meaning, and meaning again is always passing into mystery. Which amounts to saying, as we think, that there is no mystery but has meaning at its core, and no meaning but has mystery at its core. Of meaning and of mystery alike the final word is light. And the nature of light is to manifest or communicate itself: "Everything that becomes manifest is light."

Now a principle such as this belonging to reality, in the true sense elemental, comes to its own supremely in an elemental personality like Jesus Christ. Simply for the reason that no historic person has taken hold so deeply of the historic process of the ages, no one is at once so wrapt in the air of mystery and so rich in meaning far and near. "For verily not of angels doth he take hold, but he taketh hold

of the seed of Abraham. Wherefore it behoved him in all things to be made like unto his brethren, etc." (Heb. ii.16–17). Here the likeness being of necessity and not of chance, lies in His having in Himself the essential things of human personality, and all at such a pitch and power of life as to let their elemental principle be seen. Of all "His brethren" He pressed the farthest into the "abysmal deeps" of life and death and destiny, and is therefore man as none of them is man, prepared to body forth the mystery of God. To body forth the mystery of God He must needs convert it into meaning—meaning of such a magnitude as both to illumine the minds and enlarge the hearts of men inhabiting the ways of time. He must translate it into terms of life and thought, of atmosphere and light adapted to the complex nature of a soul already haunted by divinity, "moving about in worlds not realised." For it was to no mere nascent world that Jesus came, but to one "of old time" taught and tutored in the things of God, a seeker after God if haply it might find Him. If it was to a world of prophets and of pilgrims flushed with promise Jesus came, He came Himself as no mere stranger from afar, nor as unrelated and alone, but as standing in a line of old succession on the earth, bent upon fulfilling promise and declaring God to men. He ranged Himself beside the Baptist, and avowed his work. Clearly it was within the limits of a process long begun that Jesus took His place and went about His task—a fact that is attested both by His relation to the process and the dynamic action of His life and thought upon it. Supreme as was His sense of mission from above, in no wise did it part Him from the process. "Think not that I *came* to destroy the law and the prophets; I *came* not to destroy but to fulfil," is a wonderful insight into the essential continuity of past and present. In other words, process and person, person and process, were all of one,

" of one piece, one whole." The process prepared for the person, the person no less prepared for the process. The extensive preparation of the one, as one might say, comported with the intensive adaptation of the other. It is not a question open to debate since history has amply shewn that in His person there was that which made appeal to Gentile and to Jew alike. What if He was " born under law " and bred in Israel's faith, He was nevertheless of kin to the whole family of men, " the mediator of a better covenant," the " Apostle " of a universal grace. Just herein lay the mystery of Christ to the mind of Paul, that in Him both divisions of the race were included in a common human hope, fused together in the eternal purpose or design of God. " The Mystery on which Paul delights to dwell is the unification of humanity in the Christ, the new human hope, a hope for all men of all conditions, a hope not for men only but even for the universe."

The feature, then, of Jesus is that standing where He did in the historic order, the order of time, He was able to bring the elemental principle thereof to light, clothing it in a manhood—and a message—of such revealing power that it has never ceased to challenge and convince the awakened soul of man. Never ceased to challenge, for being dynamic it invokes the *dunamis* residing in the soul; and never ceased to convince, for again, being dynamic it is " all of one " with the light that lighteth every man. And the feature of Christianity is this creative personality standing at its core, and the core of history alike, diffusing the light or the power of a kindred life to the life of men. Who has expressed or can express the truth in full about a personality that takes its stand at a point of time where the ages meet, and there as from a centre speaks of God in a language and a life that make Him real and yet more real, and evermore in him that hath inspires the sense of wonder and adoring

love? Who can exhaust the depths of burning light in such a personality? Our creeds and our Christologies, so far from having exhausted them, do less than justice even to those they claim to see. It is from one depth of burning light to another in the Christ as in the God whom He reveals. The more He is known, the more there is in Him to know. The more luminous, the more alluring; the more manifest, the more mysterious—like the light itself, or like beauty, goodness, truth. In the haunting tale of Emmaus there is a hint as to the law or method of His self-revealing, "And their eyes were opened, and they knew him, and he vanished out of their sight." Vision and then vanishing into the vast beyond; sight and then light in excess of present sight; knowledge and then the unknown as a fresh expansion to be won thereafter by the insight of the burning heart. "Was not our heart burning within us, while he spake to us in the way?" which is a hint in turn as to the law or the process by which the mystery is revealed. The sight of the eye depends upon the light of the heart. "For he that hath, to him shall be given."

JAMES ROBERTSON CAMERON.

THE THEOLOGY OF THE HOLY SPIRIT.

WHILE the doctrine concerning God and the theology of the Person of Christ (Christology) have been developed, through the labours of successive generations, to a certain degree of fulness, that region of Christian thought which has to do with the Person of the Holy Ghost has thus far remained less thoroughly surveyed and charted than have other regions. And yet this is a most important field—specially important, indeed, for its bearing upon the doctrine concerning the Person of Christ. And it is an unfortunate fact that, while comparatively little has been set forth by

way of official dogmatic statement concerning the Personality and nature of the Divine Spirit, that little should reveal the existence of a serious divergence, nay, a contradiction of views as between two great sections of the Church, namely, the Greek Orthodox and Latin or Western Catholicism. It is a notorious fact that one primary cause which led up to the great schism between East and West in the ninth and following centuries was the dispute concerning the "single" or "double procession" of the Holy Spirit; the Greeks confining themselves to the statement that "the Holy Spirit proceedeth from the Father"; the Latins on the other hand, affirming that He "proceedeth from the Father and the Son." Is it not possible that this doctrine concerning the Holy Spirit—this original "apple of discord"—may, when studied and interpreted afresh in the light of advancing spiritual knowledge, even come to lend effective aid not only toward a better understanding and a *rapprochement* between those two great communions which were parties to the original controversy, but may thereby become a means of setting forward the wished-for unity of Christendom? That were indeed "a consummation devoutly to be wished"; nay more, one to be most earnestly hoped and prayed for.

The New Testament teaching concerning the Person of the Holy Spirit is especially to be found in the Gospel according to St. John, together with certain passages in St. Paul's Epistles, among which the eighth chapter of the Epistle to the Romans is of primary importance. It is in the words of our Lord as reported in St. John's Gospel that the foundation is laid for all right conceptions concerning the Person and work of the Holy Ghost. So true is this, that, while the Fourth Gospel is generally recognised as *par excellence* the Gospel of the Incarnation, it would be equally true to regard those chapters which record the closing

discourse of Christ to His disciples and His great high-priestly prayer (chapters xiii.–xvii.) as in a special and pre-eminent sense the Gospel of the Holy Ghost. Our Lord is of right the authoritative Teacher concerning the Personality and work of Him whom He was about to send to take His own place in the minds and souls of His disciples. What, then, does our Lord teach us in that closing discourse which He uttered on the last night which He spent with His disciples upon earth? In view of His own departure into heaven, our Lord tells of One who is to take His place as "another Comforter" or Paraclete, and in the same breath He speaks of His own speedy return to His disciples. The advent of this "Comforter" is conditioned upon Christ's own return to the Father. It is the Father who is to send this Paraclete, but the Paraclete is to be sent and is to come in Christ's Name. This expression "in my Name," is highly significant. As Christ has come "in the Father's Name" (John. v. 43) so the Spirit is to come "in the Name" of Christ. The expression points in each case to an essential unity—as between the Father and the Son on the one hand, and, on the other, as between Christ and the promised Paraclete. So perfect is this unity that Christ can say, on the one hand, "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father," and, on the other, can speak of the coming of the Comforter as His own advent in invisible, spiritual form;—"Yet a little while, and the world beholdeth me no more; but ye behold me: because I live, and ye shall live also" (ch. xiv. 19 R.V.). And again, "A little while and ye shall not behold me (οὐ θεωρεῖτέ με), and again a little while and ye shall see me (ὄψεσθέ με), because I go to the Father." Christ is not leaving His disciples "orphans" (ch. xiv. 18; see the Greek); He Himself is coming to them. We may say that not even a Divine Person could take Christ's place in the minds and hearts of His disciples unless that Person

was in some real sense identical with Christ Himself. No one who was absolutely and utterly another could ever be a substitute for Him. But this "Comforter" is not "another," or rather, while in a certain sense Another, is at the same time, in an equally real sense, the Same. Furthermore, the promised work of the Holy Spirit will be at the same time a continuation of the work of Jesus Christ Himself. "I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now." None the less, our Lord clearly implies that He will say these things to the disciples in due time, and not merely that another shall say them for Him. It is quite in line with this thought that St. Luke, in beginning his history of the Acts of the Apostles (which book has rightly been termed "the Acts of the Holy Ghost") refers to the activities of our Lord's earthly life as "all (the things) that Jesus *began* to do and to teach."

As we have seen, the coming of the Paraclete was conditioned upon Christ's own return to the Father. Does this mean simply that our Lord must withdraw His bodily presence from His disciples in order, as it were, to make room for the presence of the "Other Comforter"? By no means is this the case. Rather, are we to recognise in Christ's return to the Father a certain spiritual, yes, a certain metaphysical necessity bearing relation to the Person of our Lord Himself. Somehow, a change must take place within the sphere of our Lord's Personality before the promised Comforter could come to the disciples. And in order that this change might be wrought it was necessary that Christ should return to the Father. It is true that the Divine Spirit was already "proceeding from the Father" (ch. xv. 26), but from another point of view we are told that "the Holy Ghost was not yet (*οὔπω γὰρ ἦν Πνεῦμα ἅγιον*) because Jesus was not yet glorified" (ch. vii. 39). In order that the Holy Ghost might be given, it was necessary that

our Lord's glorification must first have taken place. It becomes necessary therefore to ask, What was our Lord's "glorification," and what did it involve? What change, moreover, did this "glorification" involve in the relation which the Holy Spirit sustained to the Person of Christ? The answer to these questions concerns Christology as much as it does the theology of the Holy Spirit.

Now in order to find the answer to these questions, we must go back to our Lord's baptism, and consider the relation which originally subsisted between the Divine Spirit and the Person of the Son of Man. The relation that originally subsisted between the Divine Spirit and the Person of Jesus is indicated by the descent of the Holy Dove upon the Saviour at His baptism in the river Jordan. The Son of Man became from that time as in an especial manner under the control and direction of the Spirit of God. (God) "anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost and with power, who went about doing good, and healing all that were oppressed of the devil; for God was with him" (Acts x. 38). These words have their application to our Lord in His human Personality as Son of Man; they are not spoken of Him as the Divine Logos or Eternal Son.

Jesus did not begin to communicate the Holy Spirit to others until after His resurrection and glorification. During the period that He was Himself under the control and direction of the Divine Spirit, He did not impart that Spirit to others. We read that "Jesus himself baptized not, but his disciples (baptized)" (John iv. 2). Nor did Jesus, like Moses, lay His hands upon other men, that they might thereby receive a portion of the same Spirit which rested upon Him (Num. xxvii. 18, 23; Deut. xxxiv. 9; cp. Num. xi. 17). But on His very first appearance to His disciples after His resurrection, we are told that our Lord "breathed on them," saying, "Receive ye the Holy Ghost" (John

xx. 22). The Divine Spirit is now for the first time identified by implication with the human spirit of Jesus. This was the pledge and first instalment of that Gift which, on the day of Pentecost, Christ was about to confer upon the waiting Apostles.

Now may we reverently seek for the *rationale* of these events as they followed each other in the Divine dispensation? Is not the problem as to the relation which subsists between the glorified (human) spirit of Jesus and the Holy Spirit of God to be solved along lines similar to those along which was solved the problem of the relation of the Divinity of Christ to the Godhead of the Father? "I and the Father are one," are our Lord's words. He does not say, "I and the Father are one Person (εἷς), but one essence (ἕν). While there is essential unity as between the Person of Christ and the Person of the Father, there is also to be recognised a personal distinction between Them. And in the same way, while, as we have seen, our Lord identifies the Holy Spirit with Himself, it is no less true that He always speaks of that Spirit as of a Personality distinct from Himself. (ἐκεῖνος, St. John xiv. 26, xv. 26, xvi. 8, xiii. 14).

Are we not, then, justified in saying that the human spirit of Jesus, in consequence of our Lord's glorification, has become bi-personal, inasmuch as Christ and the Holy Ghost—two Persons—henceforward share in its possession? Christ, as the Second Man from heaven, has now become "quickening Spirit" (1 Cor. xv. 45, 47). We recall our Lord's discourse at Capernaum (John vi.), where, after speaking of Himself as "the true bread from heaven," He said to those who heard Him, "Doth this offend you,"—cause you to stumble?—"What, then, if ye should behold the Son of Man ascending up where he was before?" and then immediately adds, "It is the Spirit that quickeneth" . . . (vers. 61-63). In the resurrection and ascension we

recognise the working of "the law of the spirit of the life in Christ Jesus" (Rom. viii. 2). Our Lord as Second Adam is the Source of our spiritual life, ministered by the Holy Ghost. As in the Incarnation the Son of God originally assumed our human flesh, so at the glorification of Christ the Spirit of God assumed Christ's human spirit into unity with Himself. The spirit of Jesus thereby became "quickening spirit"; it was renewed and fructified by Him who is the "Giver of life" (τὸ Ζωοποιόν in the Nicene Creed), so that the words spoken by Christ to His disciples (John xii. 23 f.) receive their fulfilment, "The hour is come that the Son of Man should be glorified. Verily verily I say unto you, Except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone; but if it die, it bringeth forth much fruit." In our Lord's glorification His human spirit was all but made Divine.[1] The spirit of Jesus henceforward becomes the channel and instrument whereby the Divine Spirit, the Holy Ghost, is communicated to His followers. Christ "ascended up far above all heavens, that he might fill all things" (Eph. iv. 10). The human spirit of Christ was assumed by the Holy Spirit of God into personal union with Himself. And thus was fulfilled our Lord's prediction (John xiii. 32), uttered when He was about to leave His disciples, that God would "glorify" the Son of Man "*in himself*." In prophetic vision Our Lord contemplates His human life as having been already completed by His death upon the cross. Of this the departure of Judas from the company of Christ and the apostles was the indication (v. 31). This death, indeed, was itself

[1] Cp. *Faust*, Part I. Sc. i., "Chor der Jünger,"

"Ist er in Werdelust
Schaffender Freude nah?
Ach! an der Erdebrust
Sind wir zum Leide da."

And (in Scene iii. ibid.) He who is said to have been once "freventlich durchstochnen" is now recognized as being "durch alle Himmel gegossen."

regarded by our Lord as His "glorification"; for this is the exact force of our Lord's words (already quoted) in St. John xii. 23, 24. (Cp. Heb. ii. 9, "We see Jesus . . . on account of the suffering of death crowned with glory and honour, that by the grace of God he might taste of death for every man.") The glorification of the Son of Man, then, is contemplated as having already been accomplished (this is the force of the aorist tense in the phrase *Νῦν ἐδοξάσθη ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου*), and in the death upon Calvary God Himself had already been "glorified" (v. 31). But a still "more exceeding weight of glory" was reserved for the Son of Man. As a reward for His act of obedience and self-surrender upon the cross, God was about to "glorify" the Son of Man, already unique in the grace of His baptism, wherein God had bestowed the Spirit upon Him in measureless fulness (John iii. 34),—God was about to glorify the Son of Man *in Himself*. This second "glorification" was to consist in the fact that God's Eternal Spirit was about to assume the human spirit of the Son of Man into personal union with Himself. The earthly "glorification" of the Son of Man was to be succeeded by a yet higher "glorification" in heaven. In theological phraseology, the "grace of unction" is now to be succeeded by the "grace of union." And going back even a step farther we may see how the self-denying act of the Son of God in stooping to assume our flesh in His Incarnation finds (so to speak) its complement in the glorification of the Son of Man.[1]

[1] Eph. iv. 9, 10: "Now that he ascended, what is it but that he also descended first into the lower parts of the earth? He that descended is the same also that ascended up far above all heavens, that he might fill all things." The glorified Son of Man is the personal Channel through whom all Christian worship and aspiration ascends to the Father, and all heavenly gifts and graces are ministered to the sons of men: "Wherefore it saith, When he ascended up on high, he led captivity captive, and gave gifts unto men" (ib. v. 8). To Nathanael, one of His earliest disciples,

And yet the glorification of Christ was not an apotheosis; such an idea would be utterly opposed to the monotheism of St. Paul and of St. John. In the New Testament the distinction between the Divine and the human is never broken down or ignored. The universal gracious Presence of Christ as the quickening Spirit—the Second Adam—is not the same as the Divine omnipresence. It is a sanctifying Presence—a Presence which is realised by faith. For this reason, the (human) spirit of the Risen and glorifiod Jesus is not to be identified with the Divine Logos of St. John's Gospel. The union between the Man Christ Jesus and the Holy Spirit is not a personal but an essential unity. Nor is it true that the human spirit of Christ is transformed or evolved into the Divine and Eternal Spirit. It may be added that, if the glorified Son of Man, while essentially identified with, is yet personally distinct from the Holy Ghost, the same is *a fortiori* true in regard to the relation which eternally subsists between Christ as the Divine Logos (or Son) and the Holy Spirit in the sphere of transcendent Godhead. While personally distinct, they are at the same time essentially one.

"God hath made him—this same Jesus whom ye crucified—(to be) Lord and Christ," is St. Peter's testimony in proclaiming for the first time in history the Gospel of the Resurrection (Acts ii. 36). To the same effect are the words of St. Paul (Rom. i. 3, 4), where he speaks of the gospel "concerning (God's) Son, Jesus Christ our Lord; who was made of the seed of David according to the flesh," but was "declared (Greek, 'marked off' or 'determined') (as) Son of God in power, according to the spirit of holiness by the resurrection from the dead." "Yea, though we

on the first occasion of their meeting, our Lord said, "Hereafter ye shall see heaven open, and the angels of God ascending and descending upon the Son of Man" (John i. 52).

have known Christ after the flesh," says St. Paul in another place (2 Cor. v. 16)—"though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now henceforth know we him (so) no more." It was not until this change had taken place within the sphere of our Lord's own Personality that He (we may reverently believe) could, in the Divine dispensation, impart to others that Spirit which had now, in a peculiar and intimate sense, become identified with His own human spirit, that He could bestow upon others the Holy Ghost in the sense of a Divine-human Life and Power proceeding from Him. The "Spirit of God" has now become also the "Spirit of Christ" (Rom. viii. 9) and the "Spirit of Jesus" (Acts xvi. 7, R.V.). Before our Lord's glorification the Holy Spirit had existed as simply Divine and transcendent; thenceforward, and in consequence of that glorification, the same Holy Spirit appears as also human and immanent, i.e. *in so far as He is identified with the human spirit of the Risen and glorified Jesus.* (This reservation is important.)

It is now seen how the doctrine of the Holy Ghost at once serves to interpret and is itself interpreted by the doctrine concerning Christ (Christology). The two doctrines are reciprocal and complementary, even as the Holy Ghost is the "alter Ego" of Christ. Only the Holy Ghost is not incarnate; His union with the Person of Christ is purely in the spiritual sphere. He is, so to speak, the *unincarnate* Christ. Is Christ "the Holy One of God"? (ὁ Ἅγιος τοῦ Θεοῦ)?—the Holy Ghost is also God's "Holy One (τὸ Ἅγιον τοῦ Θεοῦ (Eph. iv. 30; cp. Eph. i. 13). Is Jesus Christ "the Lord" (ὁ Κύριος)?—the Holy Ghost is recognised in the Nicene Creed as the "Sovereign" Spirit (τὸ Κύριον). But the Holy Ghost has never appeared in personal, human form, lest perchance men might conceive of Christ as "divided," or as though there were two Christs. He who had been "with" the disciples as the "Spirit of

God" was henceforward to be "in" them as the "Spirit of Christ" (John xiv. 17). Yet while dwelling within the Christian Society, the Holy Ghost is never spoken of as having become incarnate in the Church or in Christians. The Holy Spirit animates the Church as the human spirit animates the body. As the Church is said to be the "Body of Christ," so the all-animating Spirit who dwells within the Church is said to be Christ's Spirit. He is the Spirit *within* but not the Spirit *of* the Body. (Cp. Rom. xii. 4, 5, 1 Cor. xii. 13, Eph. iv. 4). It is to be remembered that while the Church is a "person" only in a metaphorical sense, the Holy Spirit is literally and really a Person. The Holy Ghost is never impersonal; He is never a mere Power, or Force, or Energy. And His Personality is never to be confused with our own. Though dwelling within those who are God's children, He ever remains personally distinct from themselves. "The Spirit himself beareth witness with our spirit that we are children of God" (Rom. viii. 16); but never is the Divine Spirit confused or amalgamated with our own. The intimacy of His relation with the spirits of those who are called "sons of God" is indicated in a remarkable way not only in the eighth chapter of the Epistle to the Romans, but also in several passages in other Epistles of St. Paul. (See esp. 1 Cor. xii. 4–13, Gal. iii. 2–5, v. 5, 16, 25). The Spirit is the Life of our life. Does Christ intercede for us at the right hand of the Father?—the Spirit also "maketh intercession for us," from within the depths of our own hearts, with "groanings" which, though not physically articulate, yet are offered "according to God" (*κατὰ Θεόν*, Rom. viii. 26, 27).

Now perhaps we are in a position to see in what sense it is true that before our Lord's glorification the Holy Ghost "was not yet,"—i.e. did not yet exist in the sense of a Divine-human Personality, proceeding from the glorified

Christ, yet at the same time identified with Him as the "spirit" of a man is identified with the man himself. This makes clear the conversation between St. Paul and the disciples of John the Baptist whom St. Paul found at Ephesus (Acts xix. 1–7). When St. Paul said to them, "Did ye receive the Holy Ghost when ye believed?" their answer was, "Nay, we did not so much as hear whether the Holy Ghost (as yet) exists" (ἀλλ' οὐδὲ εἰ Πνεῦμα ἅγιόν ἐστιν, ἠκούσαμεν). The meaning of the disciples' answer to St. Paul's question doubtless is—"We have not learned whether the Divine promise of the Holy Ghost has as yet been realised." Surely these disciples of St. John the Baptist could not be ignorant of the Divine promise of the gift of the Holy Ghost, which was such a prominent and essential part of St. John's message. The statement of the Ephesian disciples certainly cannot mean that they had never heard of the existence of the Divine Spirit. But they had not heard that the Holy Ghost was as yet in the world and among men as an accomplished fact, in fulfilment of the Divine promise.

May it not be regarded as a Providential circumstance that the English language, unlike all other languages, has not only one, but two forms of expression to denote the Divine Spirit—namely, "the Holy Spirit" and "the Holy Ghost"? Of course, the original Name of which these are the translation is the same. But is it not permissible to express this distinction which we have been endeavouring to make clear—that, namely, between the Spirit as purely and solely Divine, and the same Spirit as (in consequence of our Lord's glorification, now) Divine-human—by using "Holy Spirit" to denote the first and "Holy Ghost" to denote the second? The distinction would be parallel to that between Christ as the pre-existent Word and as the Incarnate Son. The Holy

Spirit is related to God and to the Eternal Word in the pre-existent and transcendent Trinity; the Holy Ghost is also related to the Divine-human Person of the Risen and exalted Christ. And just as Christ, though Incarnate, still continues to exist as the Eternal Word, so the Holy Ghost, while the Spirit of God's Son, the Spirit of Jesus, still continues to exist as Spirit of God, the Eternal Spirit of Him who is Eternal.

It may seem a new and a strange idea to introduce such complexity of elements into the conception of the Holy Ghost; but is it not true that our theology advances just by this added power of discrimination? Is it not in this same way, indeed, that all science has to advance? The distinctions recognised in the past become a basis for the drawing of yet finer and more delicate distinctions in the future. As science in its earlier stages was relatively crude, so Christian theology in its first beginnings was crude also. To say this is by no means to throw discredit upon the labours of early theologians; rather it is to honour them. To such great men as Justin Martyr, Tertullian and Origen will forever belong the distinction of having been pioneers in a new field—the great field of Christian theology. But where the labours of the fathers left off the labours of their successors must begin; and each new generation stands as it were upon the shoulders of its predecessors. The true doctrine of God, as also the doctrine concerning Christ, now involves greater complexity as well as greater delicacy of statement than found place in the ancient dogma. While that dogma is true, as we believe, nevertheless its statements do not adequately correspond with or express the fulness of the truth as revealed to-day to the reverent student of Holy Scripture. And our theology must always go back to the Bible for the recuperation and vital enrichment of its forces, even as, in the classic fable,

the giant Antaeus received fresh strength from each contact with mother Earth.

A word as to the office and work of the Holy Ghost. His office is declared by our Lord to be distinctly ancillary, in that the promised "Spirit of the Truth" (*τὸ Πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας*)—i.e. the Spirit of Him who had just declared Himself to His disciples to be "the Truth,"—"the Spirit of the Truth shall not speak from himself, but whatsoever he shall hear that shall he speak" (John xvi. 13). That is to say, the Holy Ghost is not to appear as a separate and independent Source of authority, just as our Lord Himself (as Son) did not speak or act—indeed, could not speak or act, apart from the Father (John xiv. 10 ; cp. v. 19, 30). The Spirit's teaching office is prophetic ; "He shall shew you the things (that are) to come." The scope of His teaching is determined by the limits of what is specifically Christian ; its object is to reveal and glorify Christ ; "He shall glorify me ; for he shall take of mine and shall declare it unto you."

If we have followed the line of thought which I have endeavoured to indicate, are we not in a position to review the theological dogma of the "procession" of the Holy Ghost, and to recognise that while the Divine Spirit eternally proceeds from the one ultimate Source of Godhead—represented primarily by the Person of the Father—yet, as the Gift which was bestowed in consequence of our Lord's glorification, He is the Spirit of the Divine-human Christ, and proceeds immediately from Him ? Does there not open along this line the possibility for a better understanding as between theological sections hitherto and for centuries antagonistic ? And is there not here an opportunity for theological work which, under God, shall be indeed irenic because at the same time genuinely constructive ? So understood, the statement of the (Greek) Nicene Creed—

"The Holy Ghost proceedeth from the Father"—finds its equally true complementary statement in the Latin formula recited at the Council of Toledo (A.D. 589)—"Filioque," "And from the Son." Our Lord's promise was, "If I depart, I will send him unto you." And this promise was fulfilled when, "being by the right hand of God exalted, and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost," our Lord Himself "shed forth" that Spirit whom, on the day of Pentecost, the assembled multitude in Jerusalem "did see and hear."

William S. Bishop.

THE PRIMACY OF JUDAS ISCARIOT.

The Rev. A. Wright has a striking note in the October *Journal of Theological Studies* (pp. 32–4) on the question whether Judas Iscariot was "the first of the Twelve." He argues strongly for the idea that Judas was originally the leader among the Twelve, chiefly because of the critical text in Mark xiv. 10: Ἰούδας Ἰσκαριὼθ ὁ εἷς τῶν δώδεκα. There is not much doubt about ὁ belonging here before εἷς, though it is supported only by the Neutral Class of Manuscripts (ℵBC.*vid. L.M. Cop.). The Western-Alexandrian-Syrian classes do not have the article (C^2, the mass of the uncials and the cursives and Origen). D supports εἷς also with ἐκ followed by the Old Latin and Vulgate *unus de* (or *ex*) *duodecim*. The transcriptional evidence is strongly in favour of ὁ εἷς since this is the difficult reading for the scribe. In John vi. 71 the correct reading is εἷς ἐκ τῶν δώδεκα without ὤν. Intrinsic evidence in Mark xiv. 10 will allow either of the disputed readings, assuming that the author was familiar with the facts in the case. We have, therefore, to explain the reading ὁ εἷς. Alford had long ago accepted this reading, but took the ὁ

here as "untranslatable in English: 'that one of the twelve' is too strongly demonstrative; and yet ὁ is demonstrative, and expresses much." Certainly ὁ is sometimes demonstrative in the New Testament as in the older Greek, the original use of this form. Note ὁ μὲν οὕτως, ὁ δὲ οὕτως in 1 Corinthians vii. 7. In James ii. 14 ἡ πίστις would be nearly parallel to this idiom in Mark xiv. 10 ("Can that faith save him?"). The Revised Version takes note of the difficulty by rendering, "he that was one of the twelve" with a marginal note to the effect that the Greek has "the one of the twelve." Klostermann (*Handbuch zum Neuen Testament*) explains ὁ εἷς not as in contrast with ὁ ἕτερος or οἱ λοιποί, but as equivalent to εἷς τις, "der den christlichen Lesern (aus 3^{19}) bekannte." Bruce ignores the point in the *Expositor's Greek Testament* as does Gould in the *International Critical Commentary*. But Swete faces it squarely thus: "ὁ εἷς naturally implies a contrast to ὁ ἕτερος (cf. e.g. Lc. vii. 41, xvii. 34 f.); sure, if it is to stand, the contrast is apparently with οἱ λοιποί, 'that one, the only one, of the Twelve who proved traitor or was capable of the act,' or 'the notorious member of the body,' as opposed to εἷς τις, an unknown individual; unless ὁ εἷς = εἷς ὤν, cf. ὁ εἷς τῶν ἁγίων ἀγγέλων in Enoch xx. ff." Evidently Dr. Swete is unable to make up his mind even to accept ὁ and finds it troublesome, but he does not think of Dr. Wright's solution that ὁ εἷς is here equivalent to ὁ πρῶτος.

The κοινή undoubtedly used ὁ εἷς as an ordinal. In proof Wright refers to Moulton's *Prolegomena*, p. 96. The papyri and the inscriptions support this position. In modern Greek the ordinals above four have disappeared before the cardinals. In the New Testament we have εἰς μίαν τῶν σαββάτων (Matt. xxviii. 1), πρωΐ [τῇ] μιᾷ τῶν σαββάτων (Mark xvi. 2), τῇ μιᾷ τῶν σαββάτων (Luke xxiv. 1;

John xx. 1 ; Acts xx. 7), κατὰ μίαν σαββάτων (1 Cor. xvi. 2). See my *Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research*, pp. 671 f. Moulton had already cited from the papyri illustrations of ὁ εἷς (Expositor, VI. vii. 111). The point may therefore be granted from the linguistic side that in Mark xiv. 10 ὁ εἷς can mean "the first" if the context demands it.

Certainly it is the simplest way to translate it, and there are fewer difficulties of any kind save one. Was not Simon Peter the leader of the Twelve? He came to be at last, and all the four lists of the Twelve begin with Peter (Matt. x. 2 f. ; Mark iii. 16 f. ; Luke vi. 14 f. ; Acts i. 13 f.). Likewise they all end with Judas Iscariot save the list in Acts, which omits him because of his suicide. So far as these lists go the case is decisive for the primacy of Peter and the depreciation of Judas Iscariot. Besides, the angels at the tomb give the woman a message from the Risen Christ in which Peter is singled out : "Go, tell His disciples and Peter" (Mark xvi. 7). On the great Day of Pentecost it is Peter who speaks (Acts ii.) and all through the early chapters of Acts Peter's leadership seems undisputed till the rise of James, the brother of Jesus, and the conversion and activity of Saul of Tarsus. Paul mentions James and Cephas and John as "pillars" in Jerusalem, but he picks out Peter as the Apostle of the circumcision while he himself is the apostle of the uncircumcision (Gal. ii. 7–9). But Paul does not hesitate to rebuke Peter face to face when he cowered before the Judaisers in Antioch (Gal. ii. 11 ff.).

The fact that Peter was one of the inner circle of three in the room at the raising of Jairus' daughter (Mark v. 37) and on the Mount of Transfiguration (Matt. xvii. 1 ; Mark ix. 2 ; Luke ix. 28), and was chosen to watch while Jesus prayed in the Garden of Gethsemane (Matt. xxvi. 37 ; Mark

xiv. 33) certainly lends colour to his earlier leadership, though we must not forget James and John. Peter's readiness to act as spokesmen for the Twelve goes in the same direction, though this impulsiveness was probably temperamental and not by any authority on the part of the Twelve. When Jesus asked the opinion of the Twelve about His own personal claims Peter spoke in their behalf (Matt. xvi. 15 f.; Mark viii. 29; Luke ix. 20). But Peter spoke up just as quickly and rebuked Jesus for predicting His death. Even here Peter probably represented the sentiments of the Twelve who still expected a political kingdom not consonant with Christ's death. Mark gives a touch here that seems to make Jesus read approval of Peter's protest in the faces of the disciples: "But He, turning about, and seeing His disciples, rebuked Peter, and saith, Get thee behind Me, Satan; for thou mindest not the things of God, but the things of men" (Mark viii. 33). If the Twelve followed the lead of Peter when he asserted his determination to die for Christ though all others forsook him (Matt. xxvi. 35; Mark xiv. 31), we may recall also the fact that they likewise followed the lead of Judas Iscariot when he found fault with Mary of Bethany for wasting the money for the ointment (John xii. 4–6; Matt. xxvi. 8 f.; Mark xiv. 4 f.). In fact, but for John's later account, we should not know that Judas was the one who made the suggestion which met the approval of all the Twelve.

There is at any rate no proof that Peter was an official leader of the Twelve before the Resurrection of Jesus. Judas apparently held the position of Treasurer and carried the bag. He was not suspected of being a thief till later (John xii. 6) and seems to have had the confidence of all except Jesus, who knew his real nature all the time (John vi. 70 f.). So far as we know no other man held any office

in the group. Jesus Himself was the Master, the Teacher, the Rabbi, the Lord (John xiii. 13). Peter by no means monopolised the activities of the Twelve. Jesus addresses a sequel to Philip (John vi. 5). Andrew volunteers a suggestion (John vi. 8). John reported his narrow zeal to Jesus (Luke ix. 49 f.). John and James suggest the calling down of fire from heaven on the Samaritan village (Luke ix. 51–6). Philip and Andrew come to Jesus with the problem of the Greeks (John xii. 22). In the last discourses we note inquiries from Peter (John xiii. 36), Thomas (xiv. 5), Philip (xiv. 8), Judas, the brother of James (xiv. 22). They all address Jesus a personal query, "Is it I?" after the dreadful disclosure by Jesus that one of them should betray Him (Matt. xxvi. 22; Mark xiv. 19). There was no lack of individual initiative because of Peter's aggressiveness or of Judas' official rank.

Indeed, the frequent contentions among the Twelve as to who was greatest among them seems to show clearly that there was no acknowledged or recognised leader among them other than Jesus. The official position of Judas may well have led him to feel that he was the natural one to stand next in authority to Jesus. The self-assumed spokesmanship of Peter would be resented by Judas as contesting his claims and aspirations. Peter would probably be scornful of a mere financier as the chief interpreter of the kingdom of heaven. Perhaps the other ten noticed the growing rivalry between Peter and Judas and were not without their own aspirations for the primacy in the political kingdom which they all expected as an inheritance from their Pharisaic environment. The first time that the dispute among the disciples is noted, it comes up in an academic form: "Who then is the greatest in the kingdom of heaven?" (Matt. xviii. 1). This question the disciples asked Jesus as if it were an abstract proposition, but they

had first had "a reasoning among them, Which of them should be greatest" (Luke ix. 46). "In the house" in Capernaum Jesus took up their academic query and probed this "reasoning of their heart" (Luxe ix. 47) and asked them pointedly: "What were ye reasoning in the way?" (Mark ix. 34). "But they held their peace: for they had disputed one with another, who *was* the greatest" (Mark ix. 35). They were evidently ashamed for Jesus to know this skeleton of jealousy in the family closet. But Jesus sought to nip this sin in the bud. He sat down and took a little child (Peter's own child tradition has it) and called the Twelve and set this child by His side in the midst of the disciples. Then Jesus gave the Twelve an object lesson in humility as the proof of real greatness and self-seeking as evidence of littleness. "Whosoever therefore shall humble himself as this little child, the same is the greatest in the kingdom of heaven" (Matt. xviii. 4). This incident seems to show conclusively that as yet no one is the acknowledged leader of the Twelve, for apparently they all aspire to that position and actually dispute over the proposition. It is now just a little over six months till Christ's death and after the summer of special teaching on the subject of the King and the kingdom.

But the case is worse than this. Just before reaching Jericho on the last journey to Jerusalem at the close of which comes the Cross "came to Him the mother of the sons of Zebedee with her sons" (Matt. xx. 20; cf. Mark x. 35). The people were now on tip-toe of expectation that the political Messianic kingdom was to be set up on Christ's arrival in Jerusalem (Luke xix. 11). No more time was to be lost if the long-continued dispute for the primacy among the Twelve was to be settled. James and John with Salome their mother concluded to take time by the forelock and risk all by a bold request for the two chief places for them-

selves : " Grant that we sit, one on Thy right hand, and one on Thy left hand, in Thy glory " (Mark x. 37), " in Thy kingdom " (Matt. xx. 21). It is the glory of the earthly Messianic kingdom, the consummation of which they believe is now at hand. They utterly misconceive the character of Christ's work, as He proceeds to show, but now at least there is outspoken opposition to the rival claims of Peter and Judas. If this assertiveness of James and John surprises one, it is to be noted that they stand by their position as candidates for the chief places even after Christ's mystical language and say, " We are able." " And when the ten heard it, they began to be moved with indignation concerning James and John " (Mark x. 41). Clearly there is no open leadership, but only rival claims moved by jealousy. The gravity of the matter is increased by the fact that this demand of James and John is made immediately after Jesus has spoken of His death.

But there is a sadder friction still. Peter and John were chosen by Christ to arrange the details for the observance of the Passover meal (Luke xxii. 8). So " when the hour was come, He sat down, and the apostles with Him " (Luke xxii. 14), but not before " there arose a contention among them which of them is accounted to be greatest " (Luke xxii. 24). The occasion for this fresh outbreak of jealousy was the order of precedence in reclining at the table. The post of honour was apparently the place right in front of Jesus. If so, though it is a disputed point, the honour fell to the Beloved Disciple (John xiii. 23 f.), not to Simon Peter. Swete (Mark *in loco*) argues that the apostles reclined in their usual order of precedence. But, if so, why the contention ? In fact, did they have a usual order of precedence at table ? I see no conclusive evidence of it. The orientals were very punctilious about table etiquette as in modern state or court functions. But the primacy

among the Twelve seems the one point on which they could not agree. They show their pique and ambition at this very hour when the heart of Jesus is all aglow with emotion. Their conduct is so bad that Jesus tells them that they are acting like the heathen (Luke xxii. 25). They kept up their contention during the meal till Jesus arises from the table and gives them an object lesson in humility by offering to wash their feet (John xiii. 1–11).

It seems clear, therefore, that no one was the real leader of the Twelve as they face the death of Christ. It is doubtful if the official position of Judas ever gave him ranking place save in a perfunctory way, or if Peter was the acknowledged chief till the Pentecostal blessing. There is evidence that Jesus showed special concern for Peter in His prayer for him (Luke xxii. 31, περὶ σοῦ in contrast with ὑμᾶς), in the special message to Peter (Mark xvi. 7), and in the reinstatement and charge to feed Christ's sheep (John xxi. 15–19) as Christ had already foretold (Luke xxii. 32).

Dr. Wright thinks that Judas was titular leader at first, "for he held the bag, the symbol of authority," but had long been losing prestige, and that a coterie "wanted to take the bag from Judas and give it to Peter, that Peter might become the acknowledged leader, as he already was in practice." I doubt if the facts brought out above justify such a simple solution as that, since the general rivalry and open demand of James and John argue against any real leadership apart from Jesus. This conclusion of our study leaves us no nearer a decision regarding the meaning of ὁ εἷς in Mark xiv. 10 than we were at the beginning. The Greek idiom allows either "the first" or "the notorious one" of the Twelve. The facts in the Gospels do not give a clear decision. Wright says: "I press for this meaning [the first] of ὁ εἷς, believing it to be the simplest and best." But I fail to see how one is to reach a final conclusion with-

out more light. Certainly, if Judas was ever the recognised leader, his fall was all the greater in the end.

A. T. Robertson.

THE SPIRITUAL ASPECT OF WAR.

I. *This war is not to be isolated from History.*—At present we are obsessed with the war, as parents might be with the loss of an only son—indeed, that is what the war has meant to many. War is our whole life, world, atmosphere; it occupies the individual, the nation, mankind, as if it were an unique and final catastrophe. It is difficult to get away from this state of mind. Yet these mental conditions are fatal to sound judgment on the problems raised by the war, they destroy all sense of proportion and perspective.

We recognise the immense scale and critical importance of this war; the number of combatants is greater than in any previous war; so also, perhaps, is the area over which fighting is going on. Otherwise there is nothing unique or unprecedented about the war; there have been many wars which have caused intense and widespread misery, and the wholesale destruction of life and property.

For instance, in the first four centuries the civilised world became Christian; the immediate sequel was the overrunning of the Empire by the Barbarians; a large proportion of the population was massacred, and most of the rest reduced to slavery or extreme poverty; western civilisation suffered a severe check. Naturally it was claimed that these misfortunes of the Christian Empire discredited Christianity and the Christian God. In reply St. Augustine wrote his *City of God*, pointing out that the terrible experiences of the times were neither unique nor unprecedented; such things had often happened to pagan nations.

During much of the Middle Ages, public or private war

was almost the normal state of affairs for many districts of Christendom ; the peasant had little security for life or property, or for the honour of his women-folk. Some of the most disastrous wars were stirred up by the Popes, the heads of the Christian Church. These times are sometimes spoken of as the "Ages of Faith." Yet Christianity survived and went forward.

One of the results of the Reformation was a series of religious wars, notably the Thirty Years' War, 1618–48, waged with the utmost "frightfulness." We are told that one village was plundered twenty-eight times in two years. Flourishing cities and villages became heaps of ruins, and whole districts were laid waste.

Nearer to our own times we have the Napoleonic wars for about twenty-five years, 1790–1815. These also inflicted prolonged and intense misery upon Europe.

Thus the crisis of to-day is one of a series of similar crises in the history of the world ; Humanity, Civilisation, Christianity have passed triumphantly through previous ordeals ; history, therefore, inspires us with an assured hope for the future.

II. *War is not to be isolated from similar phenomena.*— Much that is written about the war is unsatisfactory, because war is spoken of as if it were a thing in a class by itself, out of relation to the common events of every-day life. Here again, this mode of treatment renders a true judgment impossible. We are considering the spiritual aspect of war ; now, as regards moral and spiritual quality, war does not stand alone, in a class by itself ; it is one form, case, or instance amongst many ; it is typical of a very large proportion of the doings of mankind.

As regards moral and spiritual quality, what is involved in war ? *Inter alia*, it is an attempt of a nation *to get its own way*, to impose its will on other nations. There is

nothing unique about that; nations, societies, families, individuals are always trying to get their own way. Trying to get one's own way is a purely neutral matter, neither right or wrong in itself, but only according to the end in view and the means used.

But again, war is an attempt of a nation to get its own way *by force*. This also, is neither right nor wrong in itself, neither moral nor immoral, but non-moral.

Some methods, however, of trying to get one's own way have a certain moral quality in themselves; the very method used tends to keep one right. The appeal to reason implies rational standards; if a man violates them, he may be made to look a fool, to feel himself a fool; the possibility may have a restraining influence. The appeal to kindliness, sympathy, good feeling, implies mutual good will; the man who makes such an appeal may shrink from showing himself a callous brute. The appeal to conscience implies a moral standard; if you go wrong, you may be made to feel yourself a bad man.

But the appeal to force has no such safeguards; if, in using force, you transgress moral law, there is nothing in the circumstances of your activity to pull you up and make you feel that you have gone wrong.

Here again, war is in no way unique; there are many other non-moral methods of seeking to impose one's will on others; many other cases in which we appeal to force. These are of the same moral and spiritual character as war. There is the industrial warfare between the nations, in which one uses the force of underselling, tariffs, and diplomacy to deprive another of its commerce. Within a nation there is a similar struggle, one man seeking by the force of money, skill, advertisement, to get another's business. There is the perpetual contest between tradesman and customer, buyer and seller, producer and consumer,

employer and employed. These and other forms of competition have the same moral or non-moral quality as war; they are quite as much abused.

There are differences, mostly in favour of war. War is occasional, recognised as an evil to be avoided if possible. Industrial warfare, both within a nation and between the nations, is often selfish, callous, and brutal; it has all the moral characteristics of the most wicked warfare; but unfortunately it is a normal feature of life, going on all the time. There is not even any very clear recognition of its being an evil thing to be avoided.

Another difference is that the evils of war are conspicuous; the statesmen who make war, the soldiers who fight, cannot blind themselves to the consequences of their actions—"The offence is rank, it smells to heaven"—the misery and ruin they have wrought is obvious to themselves and to the whole world. Sometimes this is also the case in industrial warfare; the suffering caused by strikes and lock-outs is conspicuous. But often in such warfare the combatant may ignore and forget the distress which is the price paid by others for his achievements. A millionaire in America may be possessed by the passion for making money, for exercising power, for getting the better of his rivals in the great game of speculation. To gratify these feelings he may ruin an industry in Wales. What is obvious to him and to his friends is his wealth, his luxury, his magnificence, his genius as a Captain of Industry, a Napoleon of Finance. In Wales there may be hundreds of families ruined by his operations; but he is not compelled to witness their sufferings; he need not hear or read or think about it.

Thus a war of selfish ambition is only one example of the evil use of material and other resources, but the connexion between the evil cause and its unhappy consequences is more manifest than in many other cases.

Again, war brings suffering, but threads of pain are woven into every detail of the pattern of life. Moreover, there is nothing unusual about the suffering caused by war, either in quality, intensity, or even extent.

Further, the war has called forth courage, devotion, self-sacrifice, on the one hand; and many evil passions on the other—results constantly flowing from the ordinary happenings of life.

III. *War being typical, war problems are also typical.*—It follows from what has been said that the problems raised by war are neither new nor peculiar; they are old, familiar difficulties, thrust upon us afresh with brutal violence.

Many of these resolve themselves into the *Problem of Evil.* We are told that the wickedness, misery and ruin due to the war make it impossible to believe in a righteous and loving God. I have seen it stated that this difficulty has led many to give up their faith in God. Probably there is a measure of truth in such statements. Personally, however, I have not met with any cases of the kind, though I am in touch with a great many believers. The nearest I have come to anything of the kind is an avowal made by a minister, that if the Germans won, he would find it hard to believe in a personal God.

At any rate, we are simply confronted with the ancient, familiar Problem of Evil, the Mystery of Suffering. For thousands of years this has been a burden on the hearts of believers, a trial of their faith; from remote antiquity it has exercised theologians and philosophers, and baffled all their ingenuity; countless volumes have been written about it, yet we are no nearer a solution. Doubtless there are considerations which relieve the burden, though they do not remove it; we will say something on these later on.

The Problem of Evil suggests a criticism of God; but some limit their criticism to the faith professed in the

countries responsible for the war; they speak of the failure of Christianity. Others, meaning much the same thing, direct their criticism against the men who represent religion —they speak of the failure of the Churches, of organised Christianity. This, again, is nothing new; the Church has spent its whole existence in an atmosphere of hostile criticism; its decadence, its imminent dissolution and disappearance have been repeatedly announced. This was notably the case before the war; much was said as to the alleged decline in attendance at Public Worship, and as to the failure of the Church to bring about Social Reform. Then the war provided a new clause in the indictment of the Church—the Church, it has been said, should have created an atmosphere which would have made war impossible.

Similarly it might be shown that the important moral and spiritual problems raised by the war are of long standing; that the Church has often had to face them before, and has advanced in spite of them.

IV. *The alleged Failure of the Church or of Christianity.*— The statements as to the failure of the Church are so important that we will deal with them at greater length in the light of what has been said above.

In the first place we must define our terms. By "Church," we mean the sum total of all societies, organisations, and individuals who profess and call themselves Christian.

The term "Failure" must detain us rather longer. The mistakes made on this subject are partly due to a vague and elastic use of the word.

Churches are composed of men and women; therefore there is necessarily a measure of failure in what they attempt; no man is uniformly and completely successful in what he undertakes. Doubtless the Church has often failed to be or to do what it should have been and what it

should have done. Our Anglican friends declare this publicly every Sunday; the rubric directs the whole congregation to say after the Minister, "Almighty and most merciful Father; we have erred and strayed from Thy ways like lost sheep. We have followed too much the devices and desires of our own hearts. We have offended against Thy holy laws. We have left undone those things which we ought to have done, and we have done those things which we ought not to have done; and there is no health in us." All that merely means that the Church is made up of men and women, and not of angels and archangels. So far, it is no doubt true that clergy, ministers, and Church members have failed, and even that, in a certain limited sense, the Church has failed.

But what is generally meant by the "Failure of the Church" is something quite different, for which these facts afford no real support. When the Man-in-the-Street hears about the "Failure of the Church," he thinks it means failure as a bankrupt fails; the Church is insolvent; it cannot meet its liabilities; it must put up its shutters and retire from business. The Church has failed like a routed army, scattered, slain, prisoners, no longer an army in being. Christianity, he imagines, will soon be like the Pagan faith of Greece and Rome—a thing of the forgotten past. The Church, he supposes, has had its task and its opportunity, and has hopelessly, finally failed.

The idea of such failure is absurd to any one with knowledge and understanding of history; it is incredible to any one who knows anything of the vast forces—political, social, spiritual—which are working in and through the Church of Christ.

Doubtless there are, there always have been, there always will be, many partial failures, many grave defects; but also, on the other hand, an infinitude of zeal and devotion.

The Christian faith sustains countless millions in sincere and strenuous effort after kindliness, loyalty, and right living. The inspiration of Christianity leads millions to devote time, money, and energy to the service of God and of Humanity. This is the story of the Christian centuries; this age-long stream of Christian activity is still flowing with unabated force; it will continue to do so, and on the mere law of cause and effect, it must have important results.

The mistaken idea of the failure of Christianity is partly due to misunderstanding of the nature of religious success. We are too apt to measure by externals—the number of professed adherents, the attendance at services, amounts of money raised for religious work, the social and political power of the Church. All these are secondary. Religious speakers and writers are partly responsible for the undue importance attached to statistics on these matters.

It should be noted in passing that the current statements as to the decline in church attendance are probably much exaggerated. Largely they compare present conditions with times when there were no statistics, and thus rest on impressions. Now the impressions of different persons are very different. Personally, I am convinced that the extent of the decline in, say, the last fifty years, is often exaggerated, and I am not alone in that opinion. Some statements of journalists and popular speakers are obviously rhetorical hyperboles. You may read, for instance, that the churches are empty—I saw that in a respectable paper not long ago. It is nonsense; some churches are crowded; some are practically full; others have a very fair congregation, and so on. You might just as well make the round of the unpopular theatres, and then proclaim that the theatres are empty. My own recollections as to church attendance go back, for about fifty years, and, as far as I can remember, the kind of complaints that are made now

have been made at intervals throughout the whole period. If we go further back, to the beginning of the nineteenth century, such complaints are common in the religious magazines of the time. It is surely matter of common knowledge that the religious state of England before the Wesleys was much worse than it is now.

But let us apply the real tests of spiritual prosperity, first considering briefly what these are.

To begin with, we may notice what the success of the Church is not. The success of the Church does not consist in the acquisition of money, dignity, or power. In the Middle Ages the Popes were often the most powerful men in the world; they disposed of empires and kingdoms; they frequently stirred up bloody wars that spread ruin far and wide; these were not victories of faith. In the eleventh century the Emperor Henry IV. of Germany had a desperate struggle with the Pope Gregory VII., Hildebrand. At one time the Emperor was brought so low that he betook himself to Canossa; there barefooted, in the garb of a penitent, he presented himself to the Pope and submitted to the terms which the Pope dictated; but this was merely a triumph of worldly pride and ambition.

Crowded churches, numerous professed adherents may be due to causes which have no religious value, to the attraction of a pleasing rhetoric, beautiful buildings, fine music, picturesque ritual. The crowds may indicate that the Church is appealing to what is carnal and unspiritual. If all the world attended public worship, it might not indicate that the Church had conquered the world, but rather that the world had conquered the Church.

In estimating the condition of the Church, we must apply the maxim that "Spiritual things are spiritually discerned." The victory of faith begins in the individual soul, by repentance, faith and love, by devotion to the

service of God and man. The dominion of faith spreads by the multiplication of these individual conquests. That dominion is deepened by the growing consecration of the believer. We know that Christianity is prospering when those who call themselves Christians are more and more conspicuous for high character and conduct, for fair and generous dealing; when it becomes more and more clear that they love God with all their heart and soul and strength, and their neighbour as themselves.

Moreover, the influence of the Church is not confined to its avowed adherents. It spreads also amongst those outside a certain faith and hope in God, a certain respect for duty. Many a minister or clergyman is a gracious and helpful influence not only to his own people, but also to those who never hear him preach; they will often look to him for help in time of trouble.

The success of the Church is also shown when it is a power for righteousness in society, so that the state becomes less "a throne of iniquity that doeth mischief by a law," and cares more for the welfare of the many, and less for the privileges of the few. The influence of the Christian spirit is seen in such measures as Old Age Pensions.

Thus Christianity is seen to be succeeding when righteousness prevails and sin is subdued, whether in church members, in outsiders, or in society. If we appeal to such standards, especially on a large scale, it is soon clear that Christianity is not a failure. Let us take two examples.

Take *Foreign Missions;* compare the situation to-day with the state of things a hundred and fifty years ago. There are now great territories and races in India, China, Africa, and the South Seas, ministered to by missionaries, possessing numerous and important Christian communities; whereas, a hundred and fifty years ago, Christianity was for the most part unknown over these wide areas. The

mission work of the churches during this period is convincing evidence of life and progress; a decadent church could not have achieved so much.

Again, compare the general *Humanity* of the Church and of society to-day with that of the Middle Ages, the so-called "Ages of Faith." Those dark, cruel times were far inferior to ours in morality, in humanity, in spiritual life. Things which now rouse an indignant protest were then a matter of course. For instance, the Church, in the name of Christ, burnt men and women by the score, and submitted them to hideous tortures, because these poor victims desired to live and think and worship as they believed the Holy Spirit taught them. We do not nowadays indulge in these cruelties in the name of Christ and of His Church. That surely is a mark of progress.

Thus it may be maintained that the influence of Christianity in the world is greater than it ever was, alike in extent, in intensity, and in quality; that this influence has increased, is increasing, and will increase; and that it ought to increase.

V. *Failure to prevent War or to do away with Social Injustice.*—Something more needs to be said on the charge that the Church has failed because it has not prevented war. This cannot be taken by itself; it is only one instance of the general truth that Christianity has not done away with sin and suffering. We have specially coupled with war the injustice of our social system. As Mr. Wells says in *Mr. Britling*, p. 284, "In spite of his detestation of war Mr. Britling found it impossible to maintain that any sort of peace state was better than a state of war. If wars produced destructions and cruelties, peace could produce indolence, perversity, greedy accumulation and selfish indulgences. War is discipline for evil, but peace is relaxation from good. The poor man may be as wretched in

peace time as in war time. The gathering forces of an evil peace, the malignity and waste of war, are but obverse and reverse of the medal of ill-adjusted human relationships." Before the war, the fact that Christianity had not secured better social conditions was urged against the Church, just as the war is now; the two naturally go together.

It is not surprising that such charges often come from those who are hostile or indifferent to Christianity; and yet the indictment comes from them with a bad grace. When full allowance has been made for the shortcomings of the Church the fact remains that its general desire and effort have been to prevent war and to improve social conditions, but it has not accomplished as much as it has attempted. Amongst the causes of its partial failure there are two which may be set down here: (i.) the Church has had many enemies; they have done their best to discredit it, and to hamper its efforts. (ii.) Many more have stood aloof, watching the struggles of the Church with more criticism than sympathy.

Surely these unsympathetic neutrals and active enemies are the last persons who should reproach the Church with a failure for which they themselves are partly responsible. To illustrate from the circumstances of the war: we remember the heroic struggle of our regular army in France, the appeal for recruits, the magnificent response. Suppose there had not been that response; that our young men had held aloof, and our army had been overwhelmed. What should we have thought of these recreants if they had turned round and reproached the army with failure?

But a more weighty consideration is the persistence of faith in face of such difficulties. Long ago, in the days of the ancient Hebrew kings, sin, suffering, and social wrong existed amongst the Jews; but the Prophets who were

most keenly alive to these evils and most anxious to do away with them, did not lose faith in God, or reject His worship and His revelation. Far from it, these men maintained, transmitted, and developed the faith of Israel. So, too, through all the Christian centuries, devoted believers have been alive to these evils, have fought against them and, in a sense, failed; yet they have kept the faith, and have always been sure of God and of Christianity. There is nothing new in the situation to day unless it be a certain lapse of time; that is not sufficient reason for us to set aside the judgment, the convictions, the spiritual experience of the long succession of heroes of faith. The Christian explanation of these facts is that this persistent faith is due to fellowship with, consciousness of, God. In view of the apparently overwhelming difficulties, such an explanation seems most reasonable. Therefore, since Christian faith has stood the strain of these difficulties for so many centuries, it will not collapse under them now.

Another important consideration is that the continuance of war, social injustice, and other evils results from the fact that God neither coerces men into righteousness, nor does He enable the Church to coerce them.

I do not offer this as an ultimate solution of the problem, nor shall I enter upon the technical discussion that would be necessary if I did; this is merely submitted as a practical consideration for the judgment of practical men. Whatever our philosophical position may be as to the Freedom of the Will, we accept a practical freedom for practical purposes, and govern our lives accordingly. We recognise that there is no certain or infallible way of making a bad man good in any given time; we accept the fact; we do not desist from efforts to make him better; but if they fail, we do not waste our time railing against Providence. As nations and churches are made up of individuals, we have no ground

to expect that they will attain any particular degree of perfection in any given time. We can only do our best, carry on, and hold fast to our faith.

In our own lives we think of ourselves as having a certain control over our actions; men can use this power to do what is selfish, cruel, and wicked; we do not allow this to destroy our faith or paralyse our energies. We accept the existence of the power of choice in ourselves and others as part of the order of nature; we take it for granted in our scheme of thought; indeed, we are proud of it.

The present war is due to the summing up of innumerable acts of foolishness, selfishness, and cruelty, committed by individuals in the abuse of their freedom. Necessarily such abuse, on a large scale, causes an immense volume of suffering and sin. We may be stunned for a while by the violence of the shock; but our manhood rallies; we realise that no new principle has emerged; that our old faith is still possible.

If the persistence of war and social injustice do not warrant loss of faith in God, still less do they justify the charge of failure against Christianity or against the Church. If God does not overrule Human Freedom, it is quite certain that the Church cannot. Christians are themselves imperfect; God leaves even them at liberty to abuse their Freedom. Moreover, however loyal and zealous they may be, they are not given irresistible power to control the faith, character, or conduct either of individuals or of society. This being so, how or why should we fix a date by which the Church must either abolish war and establish a righteous social order, or confess that it has failed in its mission?

Another charge against the Church is that under the stress of war it has abandoned its own characteristic and fundamental principles; that the most conspicuous feature of the utterances of its spokesmen has been the absence of

the mind and spirit of Christ. Such an impression is mistaken and exaggerated; it is largely due to the fact that the press select for publication what is most popular at the moment, more especially what is most violent and startling. Surely, too, if a man is struggling for life against the lacerating claws of a savage beast, he may be forgiven if his language is not altogether affectionate and sympathetic. It was not Christ but a Buddha who offered himself as a meal to a hungry tiger.

Thus, while it is only too obvious that the defects, errors, and partial failures of the Church are numerous and serious, it is also clear that the Church remains a worthy and efficient agent of the Divine purpose. It renders strenuous service to God and Man, wages a constant warfare with the powers of darkness, offers comfort to those in sorrow, and redemption to those in sin. The Church provides the means of grace, of peace and fellowship with God. While it is thus powerful and active, it cannot be said to have failed.

VI. *Spiritual Losses and Gains.*—So much has been written on these subjects that little need be added to what has already been stated or implied. There are, however, two or three points on which we should like to say a word or two, because of their bearing on the alleged failure of the Church.

The war has developed a new social and religious *Unity*. For a moment, at any rate, we trust, for more than a moment, the separation and antagonism of the classes have been abolished. In the New Army, in the Munition Factory, in the Hospital, rich and poor work side by side, on the same level, holding the same rank. In the Training Camps and on Active Service Y.M.C.A. workers and chaplains of many denominations have co-operated and fraternised. The sense of new conditions, needs, and opportunities has

added strength to the movement for a United Free Church of England, and for more cordial feeling and mutual help between the Free Churches and the Establishment.

Then the War has renewed and deepened the sense of *Dependence on God*. As a friend of mine said to me, "The bottom has dropped out of the world"; the sense of comfortable security which was the normal condition of many middle-class and well-to-do people has been rudely swept away. The utter uncertainty of life has been brought home to us with ruthless violence. There are some lines of a hymn which run—

> "O! could I but relinquish all
> My earthly props, and simply fall
> On Thy supporting arms."

The war is a kind of answer to this prayer; the earthly props have been struck away; some have lost faith; others have discovered with a new reality, a new certainty, that "underneath are the everlasting arms."

Finally, the conditions of the times do not foreshadow the Failure of Christianity, but rather indicate that the world has attained to a *Fuller Appreciation of Christianity*. Substantially, apart from the pious aspirations of individuals and groups, it was a new thing that the world should hold that at a given time, in actual history, it was the duty of the Church, or in the power of the Church, to prevent war. It is true that in the Middle Ages the Popes sometimes tried to prevent wars, but more often they were busy promoting wars. Since the Reformation, religion has been, again and again, the avowed ground of war. On the other hand, speaking generally, nobody seems to have expected that the Church could, or would, or ought to, have stopped the wars of the eighteenth century, or the Napoleonic wars. That the world at large should have such ideas now, shows a marked progress in the realisation of the meaning, power, and value of Christianity.

W. H. Bennett.

PRAYER.

Prayer is the most sacred of all experiences: and he who has known the secret of answered prayer has learnt that the precious things of God are things to keep and ponder in the heart, as is recorded of Mary, "blessed amongst women."

Some of us remember the days when we were taught to pray beside our beds; mother, or grandmother may be, holding our little hands. We recited prayers as we learnt them by heart, and it became to us a duty that often irked. Later, we drifted into neglect of formal prayer, unless religious influences were at work about us. But although we fell into neglect we never forgot the lessons of our babyhood. We remembered that God had been presented to our minds as all-powerful, all-loving and all-just. We had vague ideas of Him as a mighty Monarch in the heavens, far out of sight among the stars; and of Christ who once had trod the fields of earth, and travelled the paths of suffering, at His right hand.

Then the material world took up our thought, and the misery and want, the rapacity and greed, with which we came in contact filled us with doubts and questionings.

We saw men bow before their images, and some of us perhaps, seeing their outward fervour, were led into the paths of ritual. Others, seduced by Madam Bubble, lost the last glimpse of the vision they once had had: or the soul-magnet gold deceived them and hardened their hearts to bitter salt.

Some, a very few I fear, felt their daily and continual need of God, and kept in touch with the source of life and love by unremitting prayer.

Others, and they too I fear were few, were led into paths of trial and testing for the Kingdom's sake; and even into

some sectarian prison-house to gain the experience they lacked.

To him who has known the agony and bloody sweat of the soul's endeavour to escape the ways of death, the present purgatory of discipline and judgment, from whence the Psalmist cried, "I am shut up and I cannot come forth!" prayer is so infinitely holy that he can hardly dare to attempt to analyse it, or to reduce his thoughts of it to words. It was the one link between him and the unseen God.

In a time of darkness, when there was no light, it was by prayer that he hoped against hope, and it was with prayer, surging and inarticulate, that he fought against the hordes of hell. At such a time set prayers were lifeless words, and it was in the groan of an anguished heart that his prayers found their expression. He felt at times that he could not pray. All utterance was denied him; and all that was left was the fitful longing of his heart for life and light and love.

"O Lord God of my salvation, I have cried day and night before Thee: incline Thine ear unto my cry. Let my prayer come before Thee: for my soul is full of trouble, and my life draweth nigh unto the grave. . . . Thy wrath lieth hard upon me."

If the yearnings of his heart could have been told in words, they would have been just such words as these, wrung from the depths of the soul of Israel's King.

It is not given to many to suffer these things, but only they that have so suffered can enter fully into the marvellous and inexpressible delights of answered prayer.

The selfish prayers of men bring no joy with them. It is true now as of old that "He granted them their requests but sent leanness into their souls." There may be the gratification of a day, but the same old dissatisfaction follows: the same desire for more of this and that; for the things that glitter and the things that turn to dust; the things that are vain and empty in themselves and that

merely satisfy the desires of the hour. Prayer that aims at more comfort for the body, and more happiness for the hours that fleet away—that is the prayer that brings poverty of soul and wretchedness of spirit in its train.

That prayer is truly prayer that cries in full submission, "Thy will, O God, be done; in me as in Thy Son." And this is the prayer that is learnt in the school of Christ, the school of experience and discipline.

Miss Habershon took up the words of Israel's singer—". . . but I—a prayer," turning upon them a graceful little poem—"I am a prayer," and she was right! For the Christian who truly seeks the Kingdom and longs to meet the King must always "be a prayer." But he will not appear to men as such. He will take good care to see that no man perceives the increase of his heart; for when he fasts he will anoint his face with oil so that he may "not appear unto men to fast." But God who sees the heart will know and hear, and the prayer that has risen in secret will be openly rewarded.

Now this attitude is not selfish, for no man can see to help his brother until he has found the help himself. He cannot possibly see to pluck the mote out of his brother's eye until his own vision has first been cleared.

And nothing can engrace him to this great end but the enabling grace of God; the breath of life renewing from within, the Holy Spirit!

Nothing can engrace him but the love of God, and that love is not nebulous, mystic, and a thing of unreality, an idea written down in print or uttered on the lip. It is the greatest reality that has descended to the earth. It is the greatest of all holy gifts to him who truly seeks and goes on seeking till he finds. A Christian without this love is a contradiction in terms. He is a well without water; a cloud that promising a shower passes and leaves the ground still parched.

The plain injunction, "Seek, and ye shall find: knock, and it shall be opened unto you," was an incentive to one end, and the end was prayer. For prayer is the soul's endeavour to free itself from the trammels of self-will, the inarticulate longing of the heart for God. That is the truest prayer of all—it is the bar with which the prison doors are prized open, it is the key that opens the closed gate of heaven. And its efficacy must depend on faith in Him who has gone before—faith in His life, faith in His holiness, and faith in His submission unto death.

No prayer can be of the least avail if it springs from a double-minded heart—from a heart that, doubting, does not hate and loathe the doubt.

James spoke truth when he said of the double-minded man, "unstable in all his ways." "Let not that man think that he shall receive anything from the Lord." He likened him to a man who having seen his face in the glass straightway forgot what sort of a face he had. He meant, of course, that such a man has not really seen himself, has not measured himself by the holy measure, and consequently has not yet found out that without the grace of God he is a worthless wretch, unfitted for all communion with the Father of Spirits and Author of all Life and Light.

Nor can any man be admitted into that blest communion until he knows himself as he is known of God, and learns the lesson of the Man, Christ Jesus.

The experience of Job stands as an eternal illustration of the soul's redemption. His religious friends were failures.

Then Elihu came along with the message, "If any say, "I have sinned and prevented that which was right and it profited me not, then He will deliver his soul from going into the pit and his life shall see the light." "He shall pray unto the Lord and He will be favourable unto him: and He will see his face with joy: for He will render unto man His righteousness."

So then if a man is to be a servant of the King, and a labourer in the vineyard of the Kingdom, he must first of all find the presence of the King, and it is not easily found.

Prayer alone can empower a man to obey the commands of Christ; for true prayer is the double duct that empties a man of self and admits the spirit of God into the vessel of the soul.

The holy compact between the Father and the Son, the compact of Redeeming Sacrifice, remains a mystery; nor must a man presume to pry behind the veil. But there is the fellowship of the sufferings of Christ that the true disciple has to share, and the cup of sorrow and tears of which he is honoured to partake as the seal of sonship.

The church of God is a spiritual house, and every member of the family is bound by spiritual ties that outlast time and sense. For me the church is no priest-ruled polity, no body hedged about with formal tests of doctrine and of practice. God is its Father and He alone can separate His sons. Wheat and tares must grow together until the sickle is put in. In this great house are found vessels both unto honour and to dishonour. What we have been taught to call "the church" is after all but a portion of the house; and alas! it cannot be said that "the church" has been the true spiritual expression of the Nation.

The congregation should ever be the spiritual voice of Israel, but vested interests, ceremonial accretions, with those destroying elements of pride and prejudice, have caused discordant music and made the light to smoke. Nor can anything but the earnest fervent prayer of all true men bring about the longed for change. The desire of our heart is to see the congregation as one man in prayer and praise; to see the aisles filled with manly strength and zeal; to hear the Benedictus rise from a thousand thousand hearts that beat in unison. But if we see a falling away, and a yielding to the call of diplomatic expediency in the desire to admit

into our holy fellowship the ways and means of the nation to whom have not been entrusted as unto us the oracles of God, what then ?

It should serve only to increase the intensity of our hearts' yearning ; and we should be prepared to pay the fullest price of faithfulness. There is no other stepway to the heights, no other line of communication between us and the Captain of our salvation.

Only by the faithfulness that prayer sustains can the commonwealth of Israel be truly served ; and only by its continuance through good and ill can the interest of the Kingdom be truly furthered.

The man who finds the jewel of true wisdom and treasures it can only keep his hold of it by prayer. And prayer is not the " saying prayers " as some men count it. They " think that they will be heard by their much speaking " ; and so they err, and love their way of error.

Prayer is the insistent unremitting remembering of God as the only help, and the unceasing lifting up of the heart to Him.

It is by prayer that Love is found, the Love that is the fountain of all good on earth, and whereby alone the law of God can be fulfilled.

It is recorded that " the prayer of faith will heal the sick " ; and if this be true, what a condemnation of our faithlessness it is. I know that it is true, and that if the gifts of healing have failed it is because true faith has failed. Not that God has failed, for He is still the same, eternal, never changing ; but we have failed. There is the counterfeit that loves publicity and makes merchandise of holy things ; but the true man of faith will shrink from the eyes of men and work His work in silence, loathing advertisement and all that attracts the notice of the world.

Men will say, religious men, who do their private devotions in public places and deny the fundamental principles that

the Lord laid down for ever that the Devil is at work, but the man of faith and prayer will heed this enmity as little as did the Lord Himself. If faith should so revive that the true gift of healing again appeared I am convinced that the healer would often be ignorant of his holy work. He would just cry from his heart that God might touch the sick, and pass on, leaving the work to Him. Or, if a more conscious gift were given, he would regard it as a holy thing, a pearl that must at all costs be kept from the feet of swine. He would remember that the Christ had said, "Go thy way and *tell no man. . . .*"

And how are the wounds of the Nation to be healed? How is it to be brought to acknowledge the Author of all its blessings, or to see His hand in the judgments that have come upon us?

By no other means than suffering; for suffering was ever the one road to perfectness. And even in the suffering there will be as of old prophets prophesying lies, "speaking smooth things," and the people loving to have it so.

But there will be a separating out of the true from the false, of real from the unreal; and these will enter into the meaning of the fellowship of saints the more fully as the days grow darker.

Prayer will bring the heavenly manna of divine support, and for their sake the distress will be lightened, the sorrows alleviated and the dark days shortened.

The ideal is always the energy of prayer; for it is by the ideal that we see our own shortcomings and know our folly. The ideal of righteousness reveals our sin and makes us cry out for deliverance from ourselves that we may find the fellowship of Christ.

Before us is set the ideal man, Christ Jesus, expressed in the holy teaching of the kingdom. And we know how far short both individually and as a nation we have come of it, and so we have the longing that the nation may yet be given

to see the ideal corporately, and to know the meaning of repentance.

But this can only come about if the hope is clearly seen—the hope concerning which Paul said, "for the hope of Israel I am bound with this chain,"—the hope, that is, of the Kingdom and the King.

Wherein have we actually progressed? We deemed it progress when inventions followed each other in miraculous rotation, evidencing the growth of applied science, physical, mechanical and chemical. From the dull block of coal we drew speed over land and sea: we drew light and heat: we drew a thousand colours to dye our stuffs: we drew healing medicine: but we are driven to confess that by our science we have perfected the arts of slaughter, of bloodshed and destruction.

True progress is that which moves onwards towards the realisation of the Christian's hope: and this can only be attained by prayer.

Let the Nation learn the meaning of "Thy Kingdom come, Thy will be done in earth as it is in Heaven," and the streaks of dawn will engild our sky.

Let the priests and prophets of the people loathe themselves for all their vain follies of the past, for all the empty verbiage of their pulpit efforts. Let them cry in the secret of their chambers for a vision of themselves, and then, and then alone, will they be empowered to bring home to the Nation the strong and manly lesson of its need and its salvation.

L. L.

THE ATTITUDE OF JESUS TO THE JEWISH ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE.

Under the government of the Herods and of the Roman Procurators, the Jews seem to have been allowed to retain a very large measure of freedom and independence in the

conduct of local affairs, whether civil, judicial, or religious. In the districts under the Procurators, indeed, the death-penalty could not be inflicted except with that officer's consent (John xviii. 31) and by his own soldiers: he was also at liberty to intervene at any stage of a trial, if he thought fit, and settle the case at his own tribunal. Dangerous disturbers of the peace and eminent political offenders would doubtless be dealt with direct by the king or governor, as the case might be; and Roman citizens could, of course, claim exemption from all Jewish jurisdiction (Acts xxv. 10). But subject to such general restrictions the ordinary work of administering justice was left in the hands of the Jews themselves. Each Jewish community would have its synagogue, which not only served—under the management of its ἀρχισυνάγωγος or ἀρχισυνάγωγοι—as the headquarters of its religious life, but also formed its local law-court. The conduct of judicial affairs was entrusted to an assembly (συνέδριον, Matt. x. 17, etc.), composed of elders (πρεσβύτεροι, Luke vii. 3) or rulers (ἄρχοντες, Luke xiv. 1) of the community, and varying in number, it would seem, from seven to twenty-three, according to the size of the population. They would meet in the synagogue on weekdays, under the presidency of a γερουσιάρχης, hear the cases brought before them, and pronounce sentence, as far as might be, in accordance with the dictates of the Mosaic Law. The penalties imposed were of various kinds, viz.: scourging (thirty-nine strokes administered by the *ḥazzān* or ὑπηρέτης of the synagogue); imprisonment (Jos. *Bell. Jud.* ii. 14. 1; *E. B.* col. 2722; *Jewish Encyclopaedia*, Art. "Imprisonment"); excommunication (ἀποσυνάγωγος γίνεσθαι, John ix. 22, xii. 42, xvi. 2; cf. Luke vi. 22)—a sentence which meant virtual outlawry, not mere exclusion from the meetings for worship; and stoning—subject in Judæa to the Procurator's consent. At Jerusalem was held the supreme court of the nation, the

Sanhedrin, the *συνέδριον par excellence*, which was presided over by the High Priest, and had a constitution and rules of its own, but in the main was conducted on the same principles as the local *συνέδρια*. In relation to the local courts, the Sanhedrin was not in the strict sense a court of appeal, but cases could be brought to it when the local judges did not agree. Apart from this, it exercised a powerful and extensive influence over the Jewish communities everywhere (Acts ix. 1, 2). The Sanhedrin (Matt. xxvi. 47), and doubtless also the local courts (? Matt. v. 25), had their own police force, which carried out arrests and generally gave effect to their decisions.[1]

Such, in brief outline, was the system of judicial administration in vogue in Palestine in our Lord's Day. We must now make an attempt to ascertain His own attitude towards it and thoughts concerning it.

At the outset we have to notice a couple of passages in which Jesus seems to give His approval to some of the sternest of the old Mosaic penalties. He quotes, for instance, the law of Exodus xxi. 17, "Let him who reviles his father or his mother suffer death," as having been said by God (*ὁ γὰρ Θεὸς εἶπε*, Matt. xv. 4) or as the commandment or word of God (*τὴν ἐντολὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ*, Mark vii. 9, 10; *τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ*, Matt. xv. 6, Mark vii. 13), and apparently blames the scribes and Pharisees for having set it on one side. Again, in that obscure passage in the Sermon on the Mount, concerning murder and anger (Matt. v. 21, 22), He mentions the fact that the murderer was *ἔνοχος τῇ κρίσει* in a way that seems to show that He was disposed to add to the stringency of the law rather than to abrogate it: and

[1] For the foregoing sketch of the Jewish judicial system, see Schürer, *HJP* (ET) I. ii. pp. 57–60, 73–75, II. i. pp. 149–154, 163, 171–195, II. ii. pp. 55–65; Benzinger, Peritz, and W. R. Smith, Arts. "Government," "Synagogue," and "Synedrium" respectively in *E. B.*; Hatch, *Organization of the Early Christian Churches*, pp. 56–59; *H. D. B.* iv. 642*b*; *H. D. C. G.* ii. 691–692.

we have to remember that for the crime of murder the Law prescribed the penalty of death (Gen. ix. 6 ; Exod. xxi. 12 ; Lev. xxiv. 17 ; Deut. xix. 11–13 : cf. Allen, *ICC*, on Matt. note in loc. p. 47).

Together with these passages, which seem to accord a recognition—even if only a qualified one—to the system of capital punishment as enjoined by the Mosaic Law, we may place the reproach which Jesus levelled against the scribes and Pharisees for neglecting the right administration of justice (*τὴν κρίσιν*)—a duty which He counted among the weightier matters of the Law (Matt. xxiii. 23 = Luke xi. 42 : cf. John vii. 24, *μὴ κρίνετε κατ' ὄψιν, ἀλλὰ τὴν δικαίαν κρίσιν κρίνατε*). We find Him, moreover, associating on friendly terms with members of the local *συνέδρια* and of the Sanhedrin at Jerusalem. The centurion of Capernaum, for instance, when he wants Jesus to come and heal his slave, entrusts his request to an embassy of *πρεσβυτέρους τῶν Ἰουδαίων*, evidently regarding them as *personæ gratæ* likely to obtain the Teacher's consent (Luke vii. 2–6). Later on, we see Jesus entering the house of one of the *ἀρχόντων τῶν Ἰουδαίων* to eat bread (Luke xiv. 1).[1] Nicodemus, who sought an interview with Jesus by night early in the ministry (John iii.), who protested against His being condemned unheard (John vii. 50–52), and honoured His dead body with a gift of myrrh and aloes (John xix. 39), was an *ἄρχων τῶν Ἰουδαίων, ὁ διδάσκαλος τοῦ Ἰσραήλ*, and a member of the Sanhedrin (John iii. 1, 10 ; vii. 50). Joseph of Arimathæa, another devoted disciple, also belonged to

[1] It is doubtful whether we ought to reckon Jairus here, for though he is called *ἄρχων* by Matthew (ix. 18, 23) and *ἄρχων τῆς συναγωγῆς* by Luke (viii. 41), yet Mark—and Luke also—call him *ἀρχισυνάγωγος* (Mark v. 22, 35, 38 ; Luke viii. 49) ; and the *ἀρχισυνάγωγοι* were, as we have seen, officers with religious, and not judicial functions (*E.B.* 4837 ; Hatch op. cit. p. 59 ; Schürer, II. ii. pp. 63–65). Nor is the fact that Jesus taught in the synagogues of real significance in this connexion ; for, so far as we know, he took part only in the Sabbath meetings for worship, not in the assemblies for judicial or civil business.

that distinguished assembly (*βουλευτής*, Mark xv. 43; Luke xxiii. 50, 51; John xix. 38 ff., *ὢν μαθητὴς τοῦ Ἰη οὗ κεκρυμμένος δέ, κ.τ.λ.*

The passages which we have so far examined seem to show that Jesus approved in the main of the Jewish judicial system: its right administration was to Him one of the weightier matters of the Law, and He spoke of its sternest sanctions as the ordinances of God.

But this is very far from exhausting the whole of His teaching on the matter. Over against the words already quoted, we have to set two other groups of passages, one in which He levels the severest criticism against the judicial institutions of His day, and the other in which He seems to cut Himself and His followers aloof from all personal participation in these institutions.

I. Firstly, His criticism. He exhibits the synagogues, in which He had so often taught, not only as the places where the hollow pride of the scribes and Pharisees was displayed (Mark xii, 38–40; Matt. vi. 2, 5, xxiii. 6, 7; Luke xi. 43, xx. 46–47), but—worse still—as destined to become the scenes of the persecution of His disciples (Mark xiii. 9–12; Matt. x. 17–21, xxiii. 34; Luke xii. 11–12, xxi. 12–16: cf. John ix. 22, xii. 42, xvi. 2).[1] He foretold that the judicial authorities of the nation would combine in compassing His death (Mark viii. 31, ix. 31, x. 33, 34, xii. 6–8, and parallels: John vii. 32, 44 ff., xi. 47 ff., xii. 10, 11: cf. the Passion stories, *passim*). More than once in His teaching the officers of the law appear in unfavourable colours. He alludes to their inexorable severity: "Come speedily to an agreement with thine opponent, while thou art on the way with him, lest thine opponent hand thee over to the

[1] The "hypocrisy" of the *ἀρχισυνάγωγος* in objecting to the woman coming to get healed on the Sabbath (Luke xiii. 14–17) was again a case of religious narrow-mindedness, rather than a maladministration of justice, though under Jewish conditions the dividing line between religious and civil affairs was very indistinctly drawn.

judge, and the judge to the gaoler, and thou be thrown into prison. Truly, I tell thee, thou wilt certainly not come out thence until thou payest the last farthing" (Matt. v. 25–26 = Luke xii. 58–59). In one of His parables He portrays, as a typical character, an "unjust judge" (ὁ κριτὴς τῆς ἀδικίας), who is without reverence for God or respect for man (Luke xviii. 1–6): and in the Sermon on the Mount, one of the typical instances He gives of the grievous and utter wrong a man may have to suffer, is the unjust sentence of a court of law: "Let him that wishes *to go to law with thee* (σοι κριθῆναι) and take away thy tunic, have thy cloak also" (Matt. v. 40: and cf. the allusions to "false witness" in Matt. xv. 19, xix. 18, xxvi. 59–60; Mark x. 19, xiv. 56–59; Luke xviii. 20, and to "sycophancy" in Luke iii. 14, xix. 8). It is of course perfectly conceivable that in some of these allusions (e.g. the parable of the unjust judge) Jesus had in mind Gentile, rather than Jewish, tribunals; but when it is remembered that He openly charged the scribes and Pharisees with neglecting justice and devouring widows' houses (Mark xii. 40; Matt. xxiii. [14], 23; Luke xi. 39, xx. 47), it could hardly be argued on the sole ground of the *severity* of any of these criticisms, that they must have been levelled at Gentile—as distinct from Jewish—courts.

Now severe criticism directed at an institution may be of two kinds—there is that which is aimed at the thing itself, and there is that which is aimed at the abuse of the thing. Of which sort were the criticisms that have just been quoted? That they were in part at least, perhaps in the main, of the latter kind, would seem to follow from the passages quoted at the outset of this study. Whether all of them can be satisfactorily explained along the same lines, cannot be asserted with equal confidence. In order to determine the attitude of Jesus more exactly, we must go further and examine the second of the two groups of pas-

sages referred to, those namely in which Jesus seems to dissociate Himself and His followers altogether from the machinery of Jewish jurisdiction.

II. It is questionable how far we should be justified in including under this heading (*a*) Jesus' declaration in the synagogue at Nazareth that the Lord had sent Him "to proclaim release to captives . . . to set the oppressed at liberty" (Luke iv. 18), and (*b*) His precept in the Sermon on the Mount, "Judge not, that ye be not judged" (Matt. vii. 1–5 = Luke vi. 37, 38, 41, 42): for it might fairly be argued that the former of these is to be taken in a purely spiritual sense, and that the latter refers to the personal habit of faultfinding and has no connexion with the administration of public justice. The relevance of these passages to the subject in hand cannot therefore be pressed; but it is worth while observing that the latter, especially when read in its Lucan form and in the light of passages about to be adduced, might quite conceivably bear reference to the doings of judge or plaintiff: "And judge not, and ye shall not be judged; and condemn not (μὴ καταδικάζετε), and ye shall not be condemned; let others off (ἀπολύετε), and ye shall be let off," etc. Evidence however of a less problematic kind has yet to follow.

(*c*) One of the ancient Mosaic laws required the public officials of the community, in a case of strife between two men resulting in injury to one of them, to exact "life for life, eye for eye, tooth for tooth, hand for hand, foot for foot, burning for burning, wound for wound, stripe for stripe" (Exod. xxi. 23–25: there is some difficulty about the literary setting of the passage—see Driver's note in loc. Camb. Bible—but the scope and purport of the enactment are clear). This law—the famous *Lex Talionis*—Jesus quoted, and then proceeded to forbid His disciples to apply it: "Ye have heard that it was said, 'Eye for eye, and tooth for tooth'; but I tell you not to withstand the

evil man, but whoever strikes thee on thy right cheek turn to him the other also," and so on (Matt. v. 38–42). (*d*) When a man who had been excluded by his brother from a rightful share of his patrimony appealed to Jesus to put pressure on the offender (*εἰπὲ τῷ ἀδελφῷ μου μερίσασθαι*, i.e. not simply to decide a disputed point) in order to get justice done, Jesus declined the task : " Man, who appointed Me a judge or divider over you ? " and went on to warn His hearers against covetousness (Luke xii. 13 ff.). (*e*) But perhaps the most striking and indubitable proof of His independent attitude towards the judicial system of His day is to be seen in the admittedly historical *pericope adulterae* (John vii. 53–viii. 11 ; Moffatt, *I. N. T.* pp. 555–556). The Pharisees, who brought the adulteress to Jesus, were correct in saying that the Law laid it down that in such a case the death-penalty was to be inflicted (Lev. xx. 10 ; Deut. xxii. 22–24). Jesus, however, remits all penalty : " Neither do I condemn thee ; go thy way ; from henceforth sin no more."

It is worth pausing here for a moment to realise how complete a reversal of the dictum with which our investigation started is to be found in this treatment meted out to the adulteress. The law condemning her to death was no less the word of God than that which pronounced the same sentence on the reviler of his parents : yet in the one case Jesus complains that the law had not been obeyed, in the other case He disobeys it Himself. It is true that in these two instances, His words were largely determined by His hostility to the spirit the Pharisees showed, in the one case, in relaxing filial obligations for selfish reasons, and, in the other, in " tempting Him, that they might have whereof to accuse Him." But His words, particularly in the latter case, cannot be completely explained on the ground that they were spoken simply *ad hominem*. Taken in conjunction with the intervening links in the chain of evidence, they

reveal a real dualism in the attitude of Jesus to public—particularly punitive—justice. He both approves of it, and disapproves of it. It remains to be seen whether any resolution of the apparent inconsistency can be found.

Two theories at once naturally suggest themselves in explanation. One rests upon the distinction between the Mosaic and the Christian dispensations as respectively the Old and the New. Jesus, it might be supposed, approved of the Mosaic régime as valid for the past, but now wished to abolish it in favour of His own newer teaching: the new wine of the Gospel was now to supersede the old wine of the Law. The other theory bases itself on the distinction between the private conduct of the individual and the public business of society. Jesus intended men, it is said, to guide their conduct as private individuals according to the spirit of love and gentleness inculcated in the Sermon on the Mount, but left untouched the duty of society (and therefore of individuals as members of society) to maintain public morality by punishing offenders. Both of these theories are suggestive and contain an element of truth; but neither of them completely satisfies the data before us. The first furnishes no explanation of Jesus' view of "judgment" as one of the weightier matters of the Law, and therefore as something which He could not have wished to abrogate at once and *in toto*. The latter is hardly consistent with His allusion to a judicial decision as a typical case of injustice (Matt. v. 40), and still less so with His action in the case of the adulteress, and His treatment of the *Lex Talionis*. For the *Lex Talionis* was no mere authorisation of private revenge, permitting the indulgence (within limits) of the feeling of personal resentment; it was a public measure, designed in the interests of society to be a restraint upon violence, and meant to be carried out by the public officers of the community. Had Jesus intended,

as this theory suggests, that His disciples should continue, as citizens and for the welfare of society, to carry out the *Lex Talionis*, while harbouring in their own hearts only feelings of love and kindness towards their enemies, He could not very well have abrogated it in the terms He did.

The difficulty is, in fact, insoluble unless we take into account the differing subjective conditions of those for whom He was legislating. Allowing for the existence of many grades of sympathy with Him between that of the whole-hearted disciple and that of the Jew who stood completely aloof, these two extremes may yet be taken as representative types, having very different outlooks and capacities. Both were concerned in the restraint of wrongdoing among their neighbours, but their methods of achieving this end varied widely. The policy of the former type approximated to that of the Master himself. Jesus had a spiritual power in Him that could draw tears of penitence and gratitude from a prostitute, make the adulteress henceforth a model of chastity, change the raving madman into a sane and sober being, and awaken in a crucified robber genuine repentance and a desire for true salvation. Such was the magic power of Him who went about doing good, and who, we cannot doubt, carried out His own precept by loving His neighbour as Himself. And what the Master could do, the disciple, in the measure in which he resembled his Master, could do also. "Every finished disciple shall be like his Master" (Luke vi. 40). "He that believeth on Me, the works that I do he shall do also, and greater things than these shall he do" (John xiv. 12). That is to say that just as Jesus, wherever He went, acted, by virtue of the Divine Spirit within Him, as a powerful uprooter of sin and an effectual advocate of righteousness, so the disciples, by virtue of that same Divine Spirit, should, each in his own increasing measure, purify the society in which he moved. That was to be their contribution to the maintenance of public morality—what

Origenes called "educating citizens in piety" [1]; and it was a contribution that would naturally increase in scope and power, as their numbers grew. And to the effective exercise of this reformative power, the use of physical coercion and the infliction of physical penalties would have been not only not a necessity but assuredly a hindrance. Jesus could not have touched the adulteress's heart as He did, had He been ready to stone her; nor could He have moved the robber to penitence, had He assisted in fastening him to his cross.

But for the bulk of humanity, who stood outside the circle of Jesus and His disciples, and who did not share their passionate love for men—whose subjective state was of an altogether different kind—the adoption of the same redemptive policy was not yet possible. If they were to do anything at all towards the restriction of iniquity, they must do it in the only way their comparative backwardness left open to them, that is to say, by way of coercion and penalty. That much good might be done along this line, in preparation for His own higher method, that even within the limits of this elementary system there was a better and a worse, that it was better that judicial decisions should be given against the guilty rather than against the innocent, that a judge who revered God and respected man was better than one who did neither—all this Jesus clearly recognised. That was why He could rebuke the Pharisees for their remissness in "judgment." Much relative good could, of course, be achieved by honest Jews (even if they were not adherents of Jesus) acting up to their lights in the administration of punitive justice: but their subjective limitations bound them to the use of methods which Jesus frankly set aside both for Himself *and His followers*.

[1] Orig. *Cont. Cels.* VIII. 74. Χριστιανοὶ δὲ μᾶλλον εὐεργετοῦσι τὰς πατρίδας ἢ οἱ λοιποὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων, παιδεύοντες τοὺς πολίτας καὶ εὐσεβεῖν διδάσκοντες εἰς τὸν πολιέα Θεόν, κ τ.λ.

We are now in a position to define more exactly the element of truth in the two theories which have just been set aside as insufficient.

I. The fact that Jesus appeared at a certain point in the world's history justifies the general antithesis of the Jewish and Christian Dispensations as respectively the Old and the New: but the two cannot be sharply marked off from one another by any chronological landmark. Inasmuch as Christ brought to consciousness and fruition elements already "deepseated in our mystic frame," implanted in human nature by our loving Creator, it will not surprise us to find anticipations of His teaching, on this as on other subjects, in the Old Testament. We refer to passages like Proverbs xxv. 21, 22; Isaiah liii. 4–6. And on the other hand, so long as the triumph of the Gospel was incomplete, the "Law" would have to have a place alongside of it. The change that Jesus introduced did not consist in the sudden and wholesale supersession—but in the gradual and progressive replacement—of the Old by the New.

II. The second theory referred to is even more wide of the mark. It is impossible to conceive of any of the disciples participating—in his civil capacity—in scourging or stoning an offender against the public welfare, and having his Master's approval in so doing. So far as His intimate followers were concerned, Jesus would have recognised no such division of the duties of life into personal and social. At the same time it is true that the public measures taken by society for its own protection are of course bound to be taken in accordance with the average moral level of that society; and inasmuch as the average necessarily lies considerably below the highest, society is unable, pending the complete triumph of Christianity, to frame its laws in full accordance with the teaching of Jesus.

C. J. Cadoux.

MEEKNESS AND PUBLIC SPIRIT.

When Jesus Christ uttered the saying: "Blessed are the meek, for they shall inherit the earth," was He giving the sanction of His authority to a revolutionary idea, or only prophesying the development and perfect realisation of a principle already immanent in the social order? Did He mean that possession would eventually come to the meek as a legal right to which their meekness entitles them, or only as a moral reward which their meekness deserves? His choice of the word "inherit" favours the former interpretation. And if this was His meaning, then He meant something revolutionary, *unless*—and here is the point on which everything turns—unless meekness is something much stronger, much less paradoxical, and much more difficult than non-resistance. It is quite evident that if meekness involves non-resistance, or abstention from all insistence upon or defence of rights, then a social order in which all title to rights or property rested upon meekness would be a social order in which a citizen's attempt to insist upon any right whatsoever would itself cause that right to lapse and become non-existent. Under such a régime rights would, by their very nature, be incapable of being enforced by any other means than the influence of public opinion; not the army and navy alone, but the police as well, would be vanished institutions. Clearly, then, if meekness involves non-resistance, it is revolutionary to suggest that an ideally perfect system of laws would make the earth the rightful heritage of the meek as such. But is meekness anything

so crude and simple as a mere habit of non-resistance? Is not meekness rather a higher and freer development of the spirit of citizenship? Is it not the ideal form of public spirit?

In venturing to invite fresh consideration of a subject which many may feel to have been already debated *ad nauseam*, I do so only under the conviction that there is one angle of approach which not only still awaits thorough exploration,[1] but also promises a clarification of thought that would be of vital moral importance at the present hour. It has been a sound moral instinct rather than clear understanding of Christ's sayings that has so nearly united the Christian conscience of the nation in believing that, in spite of the seeming paradoxes of the "Sermon on the Mount," participation by Christians in such a war as the present is an act which must have the approval of the author of those paradoxes. But when an instinct, however sound, tramples in any degree upon understanding, there are penalties to pay. One of these penalties I believe that we are paying already, and there is another which we are likely to pay in an increasing degree as the war forges its way towards a victorious conclusion. The former penalty is that we are deprived of the moral protection which the paradoxes of Jesus, if they were really understood, would provide against the tendency to prosecute what is fundamentally a Christian war in an un-Christian spirit. The latter penalty is the danger lest, in proportion as the war ceases to present the spectacle which at the outset so strongly appealed to the

[1] The idea that the "meek" impulse to turn the other cheek is not the antithesis but the perfected form of the retributive instinct was touched on in the pamphlet on "Christianity and Force" which the present writer contributed to Mr. Temple's series of *Papers for War Time*; it may be well, therefore, to state at once that the position set forth in this article both goes beyond, and constitutes an important modification of, the views expressed in that pamphlet as well as in the writer's earlier treatment of the same topic in *Christ's Message of the Kingdom*.

nobler of the combative instincts—the spectacle of unprepared nations risking everything in the defence of international morality—the instinct on which Christian approval of the war rested, may be less called into play, and insulted understanding may avenge itself by producing an ever increasing minority of "conscientious objectors." Against these dangers the only protection is a right understanding of those paradoxes of Jesus which a sound moral instinct regarding what is the practical duty of the hour has compelled so many either to leave on one side as a hopeless mystery or ingeniously to explain away.

When once the key to the paradoxes has been found, they cease to seem paradoxical. It becomes self-evident that Jesus meant exactly what He said—not a vague returning of good for evil but a literal turning of the other cheek—and that it was natural for Him to speak precisely in this way. It becomes self-evident, too, that He was not dealing exclusively with individual relationships but enunciating a principle which has political implications, although the political implication is *not* that force or compulsion is always un-Christian.

What is the key that is to do all this? The context gives it. Here is the complete paragraph; I choose Dr. Moffatt's version for its force and freshness.

"You have heard the saying, *An eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth.* But I tell you, you are not to resist an injury:

whoever strikes you on the right cheek,
turn the other to him as well;
whoever wants to sue you for your shirt,
let him have your coat as well;
whoever forces you to go one mile,
go two miles with him;
give to the man who begs from you,
and turn not away from him who wants to borrow."

Jesus always presupposes common sense in His hearers. To cite an instance from a different context, who in his

senses would suppose that Jesus wanted His disciples actually to amuse themselves by miraculously removing mountains? It was natural for the Teacher not to trouble to explain that this was not His meaning. Similarly in regard to the present passage no one in his senses would suppose that Jesus meant us actually to give to every beggar and lend to every borrower. Why, then, should we suppose Him to have meant that we must always actually turn the other cheek? On the other hand it would be equally unintelligent to go to the opposite extreme of removing from what is emphatically expressed as a universal command the element of universality altogether. There must necessarily lurk somewhere an "always" in the meaning of this most uncompromising injunction. Where, then, does it lie? In the case of the concluding injunctions of our passage, the question is easily answered. We know what *always* distinguishes the ideally kind man. Whether he actually grants or actually refuses the gift or the loan, it is universally characteristic of him to feel an impulse inclining him to gratify the petitioner. He will not always give, but always he will want to give. Is it not reasonable to follow the same method in seeking the universal element in the other injunctions? If we do so, this is the result we get. The truly just man—the man of public spirit—will not always turn the other cheek, but always he will feel an inclination to do so. Here, then, we get our first glimpse of the key to the paradoxes. Common morality supposes that the spirit of justice or good citizenship manifests itself in an instinctive demand for retribution upon an offender. Jesus, on the other hand, teaches that true justice or good citizenship reveals itself in an impulse to turn the other cheek to an aggressor. We know that even the instinct to exact retribution has sometimes to be restrained for public reasons, and similarly it may sometimes be one's duty to restrain the

impulse to turn the other cheek. But the impulse must be there none the less, otherwise one is not truly a just man according to the standard of Jesus, one has not the spirit of citizenship in its purest form.

The proof of a pudding is the eating thereof, and the proof of a key is the opening of locks. Let us see how far into the recesses of Jesus' thought this key will carry us. But before applying this intrinsic test we may note that our key bears one external hall-mark of genuineness, namely this, that it does not render the command of Christ easy of obedience nor reduce it to a moral commonplace. It does not make it easy: for to feel inclined to turn the other cheek, whether one actually turns it or not, is far more difficult than actually to turn the other cheek whether one feels inclined to or not. And it does not reduce it to the commonplace: for there is nothing trivial or self-evident about an injunction which requires that in place of the ordinary impulse to retaliate against aggression there shall be an impulse, equally instinctive, to invite still further liberties.

Let the first test of our key be its capacity to unlock the secrets of the most central problem of all. The whole structure of Matthew v. 17–48, requires us to assume that the instinct to turn the other cheek is presented as the fulfilment or perfected development of what is good in the ordinary instinctive demand for retribution. This is an evident consequence of the two facts: (1) that from the twenty-first verse onwards this chapter of St. Matthew consists of a series of illustrations of what Christ meant by claiming in the seventeenth verse to be not an abrogator of the Law and the Prophets, but one whose mission it was to "fulfil" them or develop them to their final and complete form; (2) that the law of which the injunctions under discussion are to take the place is the law of retribution, "An eye for an

eye and a tooth for a tooth." But while the structure of the paragraph thus makes it self-evident that turning the other cheek is presented as the fulfilment of the retributive impulse, it is far from self-evident how such a representation can possibly be true. Clearly there is here a very real problem. Expositors have been far too content to evade it by assuming that in Jesus' eyes the only truly moral element in the superseded law of retribution was its limitation of the penalty to be inflicted. Certainly if the old law had meant : "Restrain your retributive exaction within the bounds of a precise equivalence," the "fulfilment" of such an injunction might be found in a command which said, "Suppress retribution altogether." But there are two fatal objections to any such exposition. In the first place, Jesus' words contemplate not a mere suppression of retributive exaction, but the substitution of something quite opposite. And, in the second place, what evidence have we that Jesus saw nothing good at all in the retributive principle ? The assumption that impenitent sinners *deserve* final ruin bulks too largely in His parables for any such suggestion to be tenable.

If our key is to offer a better solution of this problem, it must enable us to meet two requirements. It is necessary, but not sufficient, that we should be able to show by an abstract ethical analysis that the impulse to turn the other cheek really deserves to be regarded as the "fulfilment" of what is morally valuable in the retributive impulse. We must also show, since Jesus was no abstract philosopher, that there is no reason why He may not have arrived at an intuitive knowledge that the one impulse was the truer and better form of the other by the immediate witness of His own heart.

Let us bend our energies first upon meeting the second of these requirements. The key we are using is the idea that

what Jesus insists upon as universally obligatory is not the act of turning the other cheek, but the impulse or instinctive inclination to turn it. Now if such an impulse is to be really spontaneous, it must spring from and be the natural way of expressing a permanent attitude of mind. We have to ask ourselves, therefore, what state of mind would, if it were ours, make us feel a spontaneous impulse to let a man who took liberties with one cheek proceed to take the same with the other, or to allow a man who attempted one act of unjust appropriation at our expense to make free with our other possessions.

Something approximating to such a state of mind is attributed by the Book of Acts to the primitive Christian community in the early days after Pentecost. "The multitude of them that believed," we are told, "were of one heart and soul; and not one of them said that aught of the things which he possessed was his own, but they had all things common." That this does not mean that they denied the right of an owner to retain his possessions is evident from the words of the Apostle Peter to the deceitful Ananias. What it does mean is simply that these early Christians were so one in sympathy and mutual devotion that none of them cared to retain a possession when he found that others needed it. Now suppose that besides not caring to retain possessions when others needed them, they had also not cared to retain any possession if another man, whether he needed it or not, simply *grudged* them their possession of it. Such a lack of desire to call one's own what any man whatever grudges one the possession of would be a state of mind in which there would quite naturally and inevitably spring up those impulses which Christ requires of us in the teaching under discussion. The man who, when smitten on one cheek, feels inclined to turn the other, says in effect to his assailant: "I have hitherto claimed the liberty to be free

from assault; but, since I find that you are unwilling to accord me that liberty, the desire to claim it has disappeared: you may hit me as often as you choose." Similarly the man who feels inclined to surrender the second garment or walk the second mile says in effect to the aggressor: "I have hitherto counted my clothes (or my time) my own; but, since I find that you are reluctant to acknowledge my ownership, I no longer feel any desire to assert possession: I cordially make you free to take what liberties you like." Evidently, then, if we wish to discover the kind of spirit that will feel a spontaneous impulse or inclination to turn the other cheek, we must look for it in the man who cannot help losing all pleasure in retaining any particular right or possession as soon as he perceives that this right or possession is grudged to him by another human being. Such a man might in many cases still feel it his *duty* to assert and maintain his title; but his first impulse would be the other way, for his pleasure in any property or right vanishes whenever he finds that it is not accorded to him willingly.

The conception at which we have thus arrived of the permanent attitude of mind which would render instinctive the impulse to reply to aggression by a frank surrender to further liberties, puts us in a position to meet the second of the two requirements mentioned above. If in the first enthusiasm of its new faith the primitive Church exhibited, as we have seen, an attitude in respect of property that was within measurable distance of the state of mind which we have been describing, it is not difficult to suppose that the latter was the permanent mental attitude of Jesus Himself. And if it was, then simple self-observation would make Him aware that in circumstances where others felt the impulse to demand a *quid pro quo* from those who injured them, He Himself felt an impulse to make the aggressor frankly welcome to carry his exactions even further than he

at first contemplated. The ordinary impulse, sanctioned as it was by the Mosaic law, did not seem entirely destitute of moral worth ; yet He found in Himself a better impulse. Accordingly it need not have been anything more recondite than an intuitive interpretation of the facts before Him, when He proclaimed the latter impulse as the true "fulfilment" of the former and enunciated the new law as the "fulfilment" of the old.

We must now turn back to the first of the two requirements that have to be met by the use of our key. We have to show by an abstract analysis that Christ's intuition was really sound, and that the new law does "fulfil" or perfect that which was good in the old.

To the extent that it is morally worthy, the desire for retribution is an impersonal feeling. When purified from all traces of mere vengefulness, it becomes an impersonal demand that the system of rights and obligations decreed by the general will of the community shall be maintained intact. In this form the desire to insist on retribution is, therefore, nothing but a manifestation of the spirit of good citizenship ; it is the negative side of what, on its positive side, is the true citizen's spirit of loyal and spontaneous obedience to the laws of the state.

Let us look for a moment into the nature of this spirit of law-abidingness which is the source of what is good in the demand for retribution. Although in many cases it may be little more than a habit of external conformity strengthened by a latent consciousness of the penalties which the law holds in reserve, yet every one will concede that such cases are the merest parody of the spirit of the true citizen or the really just man. The latter's obedience must be spontaneous. He must disdain to steal or defraud or commit an assault, and in any case of civil litigation he must lose all desire to press a claim that has been decided against

him. Now what does this disdain signify? Theft and fraud consist in treating as one's own anything of which the general will, as expressed in the laws, does not freely acknowledge one's ownership. An assault consists in claiming as one's own a liberty in respect of another's person to which the general will does not freely recognise one's title. Is it much of a margin, let us now ask, that separates the disdain to commit such acts from the spirit that feels inclined to turn the other cheek or surrender the second garment? Not a wide margin, so far as verbal definition goes. He who disdains to commit an assault loses all desire to claim this liberty in respect of the human person as soon as he perceives that *the general will* does not freely recognise his right thereto. On the other hand, he who has the impulse to turn the other cheek has lost all desire to claim the inviolability of his person as soon as he discovers that *another human being* does not willingly concede him that right. Again, he who disdains to steal or defraud or to press a claim that has been legally disallowed, becomes free of all desire to treat some particular object as his own because he knows that *the general will* is unwilling to accord him possession. On the other hand, he who feels the impulse to surrender the second garment as well as the first has lost the desire to maintain ownership through discovering that it is regarded grudgingly by *another human being.* Put the phrase, "another human being," in place of "the general will," and the definition of the spirit of true citizenship becomes a definition of the attitude that Christ requires. Inwardly the two attitudes differ only as the historically conditioned and incompletely evolved differs from the intrinsic and the fully unfolded. The community of spirit between citizens as such produces the law-abiding spirit; but let this communal spirit be broadened into a dissatisfaction with any unity of will which fails to include a single

human being, whether fellow-citizen or social outcast or foreigner, and it will become the spirit that wants to turn the other cheek. Is it not clear, then, that the intuition of Jesus is justified at the bar of abstract analysis, and that His new law, as this article interprets it, is indeed the "fulfilment" of the old?

Under one most decisive test our key has seemed to fulfil all expectations. The other tests can be more rapidly applied. The next in order of importance is the question of its capacity to solve the difficulties created by the common idea that what Christ condemns, in His teaching about non-resistance, is the employment of force or compulsion of any kind. It is necessary to say, "force *or compulsion*," because if what is forbidden in the example of the slap upon the cheek is the *act* of meeting violence with violence, then the second example condemns counter-litigation and the third condemns passive resistance. Now, if all actions that involve any kind of compulsion are prohibited, at once a number of perplexities arise.

In the first place, since compulsion is compulsion, whether employed in self-defence or in defence of others, why did Jesus confine His examples to cases where the individual's own interests alone were concerned? Will it not become necessary to hold, for instance, that the very idea of going to the defence of Belgium was wrong, not simply on the perhaps arguable ground that such intervention would do more harm than good, but for the morally paradoxical reason that it is wrong to use force even in defence of others? If Jesus really meant to inculcate this paradox, why did His examples carefully avoid the very case in which, as He must have known, people would be most tempted to invent exceptions to His new law? Nevertheless, if it is compulsion as compulsion that is wrong, we have no choice but to hold both that Jesus meant to inculcate this moral para-

dox and that He neglected to enforce it by instances.

In the second place, the assumption that compulsion as such is what Christ condemns both strikes at the root of parental discipline and empties the word "Providence" of most of its meaning. Compulsion is not less compulsion when it is applied by an unseen Divine hand. If it were morally wrong for God to "compel" men to build other than they planned, by disappointing their hopes and hedging them in by circumstances against which their wills fruitlessly rebel, could we still speak of "Providence"?

Difficulties such as these, however, disappear at once on acceptance of the interpretation of Christ's meaning for which we are here contending. They all rest on the assumption that what He forbids is the employment of force or compulsion. But it is not the *act* of compelling that He prohibits. A reluctant use of force may sometimes be a duty alike for God and for man. What Jesus does condemn is any feeling of pleasure at getting one's own way against another person's will, even when one's own way is equitable and the will of the other is unjust.

A third way of testing our key is by applying it to the saying quoted at the beginning of this article. According to our view the law-abiding spirit of the true citizen is the seed of which meekness, or the attitude from which springs the impulse to turn the other cheek, is the full-grown fruit. Now, even on the principles of our present social order, it is in theory true that the law-abiding alone are entitled to civic rights and to be maintained in the enjoyment of property. There is therefore nothing revolutionary in predicting that when our social order becomes what it ought to be, theory will have become fact: the law-abiding will be in actual possession of the earth to which even now none other has rightful title, and their law-abidingness will have deepened into the meekness of which it is the promise.

It remains to apply to our interpretation one final test, and the application of this test will merge naturally into a very brief discussion of the practical bearing of Christ's teaching. The test consists in enquiring whether our view has the merit of making it seem entirely natural and inevitable that Christ should have enunciated His new law by means of examples alone, and should have chosen precisely the kind of instances which He in fact selected.

It is of the very essence of morality that what in it is universally obligatory can never be expressed in definitions of ways of acting that are always right or always wrong. Circumstances are never quite the same, and a right action must always perfectly fit the circumstances. Morality is the perfect self-adjustment of the spirit of the agent to the spirit of each situation as it comes, and, being thus spontaneous and living, like all life it defies definition. But men can recognise and name that which they cannot define ; and had men been familiar with the spirit of that perfect morality which delights in turning the other cheek whenever it may, they would doubtless have had a name for it. In that case it would have been open to Jesus, by using this name, to indicate at once that it was an attitude and not an unfailing rule of action that His new law enjoined. But there was no name available, for " meekness " was understood in too passive and negative a sense to be an unambiguous expression of His meaning. Perforce He had to adopt the only other way of expressing what is inward and spiritual, namely by giving examples of the outward conduct in which it spontaneously manifests itself.

It was equally inevitable, if our interpretation be correct, that the examples which He chose should be of a trivial kind, and should deal with a man's action in cases of offences by which he is himself the sufferer ; for, as a rule, it is only under such conditions that the attitude which Jesus was

seeking to inculcate is at liberty to manifest its nature without disguise or restraint. If an assailant, instead of threatening one's cheek, threatens one's life, the impulse which Jesus demands of us to let him have his way may have to wrestle with the equally good impulse to save him from achieving a deed which, when the moment of passion has gone by, he will bitterly regret for the rest of his life. Or again, if other people's interests are, directly or indirectly, assailed by the offender's action, then even if there still be room for some modified form of the impulse of surrender, it ought to have to contend with the generous impulse to respect the more equitable claims which others than the offender have upon one for the defence of their interests. In either of these supposed cases whatever action it may be right to take will be adopted under the stimulus of at least two conflicting good instincts, and so may not serve to exemplify with clearness either of the attitudes involved. Normally, indeed, duty is likely to require in such cases a complicated course of action, of which the first step may often be a resistance of the attempted injury, although this must be followed up by an endeavour to find some way of making plain to the offender how willing one is to further his desires when higher considerations do not forbid. On the other hand, when nothing more serious is involved than a blow on one's own face or a reduction of one's own wardrobe or a demand upon one's own leisure, there will not ordinarily be any sufficient reason why the impulse to make the aggressor welcome to work his will should not be given free play. Precisely such cases, therefore, offered the most telling illustration of the attitude which, according to our interpretation, Jesus desired to enjoin.

Possibly the objection may suggest itself that even in the trivial instances chosen by Christ a closer analysis would reveal the presence of those higher considerations which, it

has just been admitted, may have the right to overrule the impulse to submit; and from this it may be argued that as soon as we concede that the good impulse to turn the other cheek has no more right than any other good impulse to rule our conduct without restraint, we shall be driven on from one instance of overruling conditions to another, until we are forced to confess that, however good in itself the impulse may be, in no practical situation can it ever be rightly accorded free play.

Such an admission would, of course, be fatal to our interpretation, but the admission is quite unnecessary. In order that it may be right to turn the other cheek in actual practice, it is not requisite that there shall be *no* good reason against doing so, but only that the reasons *against* shall be insufficient to outweigh the reason *for* such a course. Our analysis hitherto has been concerned with the spontaneity of the required impulse to submit to unwarranted liberties, and with the general attitude in regard to the tenure of rights which alone can render such an impulse spontaneous. But it is now time to add that, provided there is present the spontaneous impulse, there emerges a reflective reason for carrying out deliberately, even at considerable sacrifice of other than selfish interests, the action to which spontaneous impulse urges.

What is this reflective reason? It is that such conduct as is illustrated in Jesus' examples, *when it is spontaneous*, is calculated to exert a most powerful influence toward the moral reformation of the offender. It is not likely, indeed, to exert such an influence if the sole motive prompting the conduct is a self-conscious intention of reforming the wrongdoer by the moral object-lesson of non-resistance. But when the wronged person has a spontaneous inclination to make the aggressor frankly welcome to please himself at his expense, then the afterthought that such conduct may work

a reformation in the latter may often justify him in sacrificing really important considerations in order to give vent to his generous impulse. For the sake of contributing to the regeneration of a malicious *will* it is morally worth while to submit to a malicious *act*, even when its achievement entails consequences of a very serious kind. Accordingly, to our first conclusion that Jesus regards the *impulse* to turn the other cheek as right in itself apart from all consequences, and *requires* of us an attitude in respect of our rights which will make us always feel this impulse, we may now add the further conclusion that the *act* of giving outward expression to this inner impulse is one which any true interpretation of His teaching will *recommend* as being often the most forceful way of combating evil at its very root.

It needs no subtlety to realise that this moral justification for giving effect in action to the morally right impulse to submit freely to aggressive liberties is present only to the degree in which the liberties taken are at the expense of the submissive person himself. No evil-doer is likely to be converted from his wicked ways by the spectacle of a forbearance the cost of which falls mainly or wholly on others than the person who forbears. Consequently, even if there be room in such cases for some form of the impulse to submit, the absence of the moral reason for allowing actual expression to this impulse will leave the field clear for all the morally worthy reasons against any such course, with the result that the impulse will find liberty to express itself, if at all, only in a roundabout manner. And since unjust actions of a serious kind usually involve, in a greater or less degree, other interests of a private and public kind than those of the immediate sufferer, the latter may often have a very difficult problem to face in deciding how far he is morally at liberty to submit and how far duty requires him to resist the immediate act of injustice and to be content

to wait for some other opportunity of manifesting generosity to the wrongdoer.

This conclusion in no way detracts from the greatness of Him who enunciated the law of non-resistance. True moral teachers do not intend to enact rules for slavish obedience, but to expound principles, leaving to the individual that labour of applying principles to concrete situations without which no conduct is completely moral. Indeed, so far from diminishing the worth of Christ's new law, the admissions made rather enhance its impressiveness. Having conceded that He is not responsible for the morally paradoxical idea that duty requires the other cheek always to be turned in actual fact, our consciences are set free to bow reverently before His teaching that an inclination to turn it is always obligatory. If our instinct that the present war is fundamentally Christian compelled us to ignore as a dark mystery a saying of Jesus which appeared to be directed against all use of force, then we should be prone to exaggerate our instinctive certainty that in the present exceptional circumstances the act of warfare cannot, in spite of that saying, be contrary to His will into the assumption that under the same exceptional circumstances it is also permissible to feel delight in the retribution we are exacting. On the other hand, as soon as we perceive that no mystery stands in the way of recognising this war to be an act which has the approval of Christ, we lose all excuse for questioning the unconditional bearing of His new law on the spirit in which the war ought to be prosecuted. In the writer's personal opinion duty to the world at large requires the Allies to continue hostilities until a result is reached which, from the point of view of past German aspirations, must seem to our enemies terribly disastrous. Nevertheless it appears to be absolutely required by Christ's teaching that this endeavour be prosecuted in a spirit of solemn sadness,

and that it be accompanied both by regret that it was not permissible for us as a people to turn the other cheek and by a hope that some day our moral responsibilities to the rest of the world may no longer forbid us to exhibit national generosity toward the peoples against whom we are fighting. Not for a moment do I mean to suggest that there ought to be no sternness in our emotional attitude toward the enemy. But stern condemnation and yearning tenderness are not incompatible phases of one and the same spiritual poise: in Jesus Himself we see them perfectly combined, and where He creatively hewed out the moral path, surely we too may learn to follow.

A. G. Hogg.

ST. PAUL AND THE LAW.

Probably no single cause has been so powerful in preventing the intelligent reader from availing himself of the spiritual wealth of the Pauline Epistles as the elaborate arguments presented in them which turn upon the functions of the Law. Buttressed as these are by a formidable array of quotations from the Old Testament, often torn from their context and suggesting an artificial type of dialectic, they appear so completely anachronistic in the modern world as to be negligible even by those who are seriously interested in religion. Yet it is significant that they are most deeply embedded in those Epistles which reveal the Apostle as grappling with the fundamentals of Christian experience. No doubt they belong primarily to that phase in his career in which he has to make his *apologia* for the particular Gospel which he preaches, in the face of bitter opposition from within the Christian community. But that very fact implies that the situation is a matter of life or death for St. Paul. He is not arguing because he enjoys it, nor because

he desires to win a controversial triumph over his antagonists. He is convinced that the whole future of religion is at stake, for the future belongs to Christianity. It is not, therefore, a mere combat with Judaism into which he throws all the powers of his nature. It is the establishment of the essential significance of man's relation to God. Judaistic propaganda in the Church is but an incident in the process. The principles he endeavours to set forth have a universal bearing. And so it is not by accident that his interpretation of Legalism finds its largest place in the Epistle to the Romans, which is, in a sense, the only manifesto that Paul ever promulgated.

The material supplied by the Epistles on this subject has frequently been classified and examined with microscopic care. Much attention has been devoted to such questions as the difference between Paul's use of νόμος with and without the article : the possible distinction between the Jewish Law as a concrete whole and the legal principle as a factor in religion : the concentration of emphasis in certain passages on definite aspects of the Law, such as the external or ritual in contrast with the moral. Interesting and valuable conclusions may be drawn from such investigations.[1] And these will undoubtedly affect the wider aspects of the situation. But I am convinced that the intrinsic significance of Paul's relation to the Law will only come out if the discussion is planned on the broadest possible lines.

At the very outset we are confronted by a difficulty. If we could say without more ado : " These statements represent Paul's pre-Christian estimate of the Law ; those, that which he arrived at as a follower of Christ," some sort of order might be introduced into the process of his reflection upon the subject. But that is impossible. For his experi-

[1] See, e.g., Prof. E. D. Burton's articles in *American Journal of Theology*, vol. xi.

ence as a Pharisee is interpreted from his new Christian position. And we cannot assume that the movement of his inner life in his pre-Christian days presented itself to his self-examination in the same shape as that which it now assumes for his transfigured vision. On the other hand, the memory of his earlier attitude is sure to remain at some points influential. Presuppositions which he never questioned as a zealous Jew must inevitably have coloured his later thinking, even after he had more or less consciously dropped them. Few men can strip themselves of their earlier beliefs as of a worn-out garment. Recognition of these facts will help us to understand the apparent contradiction on which so much emphasis has been laid.

Let us recall the point from which Paul started. Perhaps nowhere do we get a more vivid picture of his presuppositions than in Deuteronomy xxviii. and xxx. "And it shall come to pass, if thou shalt hearken diligently unto the voice of the Lord thy God, to observe and to do all his commandments which I command thee this day . . . all these things shall come on thee . . . if thou hearken unto the voice of the Lord thy God. . . . But . . . if thou wilt not hearken unto the voice of the Lord thy God, to observe to do all his commandments and his statutes which I command thee this day; that all these curses shall come upon thee and overtake thee. . . . I call heaven and earth to record this day against you that I have set before you life and death, blessing and cursing: therefore choose life, that both thou and thy seed may live" (Deut. xxviii. 1, 2, 15, xxx. 19). As a matter of fact, Paul quotes from this very context xxvii. 26 to make clear the inexorable standard set up by the Law (Gal. iii. 10), and, with great daring, applies the remarkable words of xxx. 11–14, which emphasise the accessibility to men of God's commandments, to the Gospel of Christ as lying within the reach of all (Rom. x. 6–8).

His use of these passages sheds light upon two important strains in his thought, for which allowance must be made throughout his writings. First, there is the postulate which he never thinks of questioning : " Cursed is every one who fails to abide by *all* that is written in the book of the law, so as to perform it " (Gal. iii. 10). That certainly represents his own original position. And when the Law is made the sole criterion of acceptance in God's sight, there is no other position possible. " I testify to every man who submits to circumcision that thereby he comes under obligation to perform the whole law " (Gal. v. 3). The principle seems to find universal recognition. For a much later New Testament writer asserts that " the man who observes the whole law, except for a lapse at a single point, is guilty as regards the whole " (James ii. 10, where Mayor collects statements of the same maxim from Rabbinic writers). The Law admits of no compromise. It is all or nothing. This view, which Paul can justify from the Old Testament itself, has had a far-reaching effect on his spiritual history. And he does not stand alone. A similar standpoint is implied in the utterances of 4 Ezra : " Our fathers who received the law observed it not, and the statutes they did not keep, and yet the fruit of the land did not perish, nor could it, because it was thine ; but they who received it perished, because they kept not that which had been sown in thee. . . . We who have received the law and sinned must perish, together with our heart, which has taken it in " (ix. 32, 33, 36). This writer also is conscious of the universal failure of his people to keep the Law, and he shudders at the terrible consequences which are inevitable. Plainly he has set the highest legal ideal before him, and nowhere does he find it attained. Paul, in the same fashion, looks beyond his personal experience and sees it confirmed in the case of many of his fellow-countrymen who would refuse assent to his

inferences. "Not the hearers of the law," he says, "are righteous in God's sight, but only the doers of the law shall be justified. If you possess the name of Jew and lean upon the law and pride yourself on God and know his will and can decide between right and wrong because you are instructed by the law, and are convinced that you can guide the blind, be a light to those in darkness, . . . a teacher of the inexperienced . . . do you think of teaching yourself, you who teach other people . . . you who pride yourself on the law, do you dishonour God by breaking it? Why, it is your fault that the name of God is slandered among the heathen, as the Scripture says" (Rom. ii. 13, 17 ff.). It was no morbid obsession that made Paul despair of Legalism. No man was ever more wide-awake to facts. And his perception convinced him that the proud claims of Judaism were based on a fiction.

The second strain in his thought made evident by his treatment of the passages from Deuteronomy quoted above is his conviction of the inviolable authority of the letter of the Law. Throughout the Epistles he adduces statements from the Old Testament to prove his positions, and feels no need of further argument, because he regards the text of Scripture as literally the Divine word. His typically Rabbinic method in the use of such statements appears in Romans x. 6–8, where he cites Deuteronomy xxx. 11–14, and not only ignores its context, but employs the quotation to defeat the very purpose for which it was originally written. For the aim of the Deuteronomist is to glorify the Law of God in its adaptability to the needs of men. But Paul applies the words to the righteousness that comes from faith, and the confession it involves that Jesus is Lord. Similarly, in urging upon the Corinthian community the duty of supporting their Christian teachers (1 Cor. ix. 9, 10), he quotes as decisive a legal precept from Deuteronomy xxv.

4, " Thou shalt not muzzle the ox that treads the corn." " Does God concern himself with oxen," he asks, " or is the precept given entirely on our account ? " And he answers, " Of course it was written on our account." His position is clear. The words of the Law are the Divine utterance, and absolutely trustworthy, but there is a deeper sense than the literal which widens the range of their application. Here Paul shows himself in line with the allegorising exegesis of Philo, only, while Philo strives to prove the agreement of the Old Testament with Greek philosophy, Paul finds in it an anticipation of the Christian religion.

But when the Apostle has to deal with the Law itself as the norm of Jewish religion, he is confronted by a peculiar difficulty. Its precepts are without exception the word of God. This must be borne in mind when attempts are made to explain some of Paul's statements by saying that in them he has in view not the ethical but the ceremonial side of the Law. That, no doubt, may often be true, but it does not affect his fundamental presuppositions as an earnest Jew. The Law is one, and its claims form a unity. The problem with which he has to grapple arises from the fact that the Law, which is assumed to be the vehicle of Divine revelation, has proved " unable to bestow life " (Gal. iii. 21). And yet, as the writer of 4 Ezra says, " this is the way of which Moses, while he was alive, spoke unto the people, saying : Choose thee life that thou mayest live " (vii. 129). It is scarcely necessary to point out that both Paul and this writer, like all devout Jews of their time, interpret these words not of mere earthly well-being but of the life which is eternal.

Now, in the Epistle to the Romans, which falls within the middle period of his missionary activity, he makes certain statements which would seem to leave no doubt as to his fundamental position. In answer to the question, Is the Law sin, a question prompted by strong assertions in the

verses preceding as to "dying to the law," he replies, after making some explanatory statements, "the law is divine (ἅγιος) and the commandment divine and righteous and good" (Rom. vii. 12) In the same context he attempts on fresh lines to account for the failure of the Law in helping men to a satisfying relation towards God, and ends by asserting: "We know that the law is spiritual" (Rom. vii. 14). Here, indeed, it might be possible to catch the tone of an inherited belief. But when he proceeds to lay bare the complex workings of his inner life in his pre-Christian days, he emphasises the fact that, in presence of the Law, he does, not what he truly desires but what he hates, and he finds in this a testimony to the moral worth of the Law (Rom. vii. 16). Summing up that past experience, which he dramatically describes in the present tense and in the light of his subsequent spiritual transformation, he concludes that his "inner man," that element in human nature akin to the Divine, finds satisfaction in the Law of God, but is opposed by an evil principle which brings him into subjection. "That means that, left to myself (αὐτός), I serve with my mind [νοῦς = ὁ ἔσω ἄνθρωπος] the law of God, but with my flesh the law of sin" (Rom. vii. 22 f., 25).

This is the kind of position we should expect Paul to take in virtue of his attitude to the Old Testament. As a matter of fact, it conflicts with his real Christian outlook. As early as the Epistle to the Galatians, he lays emphasis on the inferiority of the Law as the disclosure of the Divine will to the gift of God's grace in Jesus Christ (Gal. iii. 17–20). But this is supplemented by his conception of its preparatory function as a discipline. In his later letters, however, extenuating circumstances seem to fall out of account. The Law meant bondage to "elemental spirits," "principalities and powers," through whom the legal dispensation was administered, and whom God has "stripped off" us

in the victory of Christ (Col. ii. 20, 10, 15). It was a bond, consisting in rules and regulations, for which men were liable, a menacing bond which God has for ever cancelled by nailing it to the Cross (Col. ii. 14). It constituted a feud (ἔχθρα) between Jews and Gentiles, and also, secondarily, a feud between men and God, in the sense of restricting their access to the Father, and this has been abolished in Christ (Eph. ii. 14–16). These passages certainly suggest a development in the nature of Paul's attitude to the Law. And it is a development which we might naturally expect as he became more and more profoundly aware of all the implications of his Christian position.

Let us attempt, on the basis of the Epistles, a more detailed analysis of the various factors in Paul's estimate of the Law. Again it must be emphasised that the explanations he gives of the various stages in his pre-Christian experience were not such as could have suggested themselves at that time. He was confronted by a standard of duty which he believed to be a positive enactment of the Divine will. His nature yearned for religious satisfaction and peace. But its reaction to that rule of life which could have no other aim than to bring men to God resulted not in glad obedience but in a tormenting struggle. He left nothing undone in the way of obeying, but his obedience he felt to be spiritually ineffective. And when in this condition of unrest he met Christ, he discerned once for all that he had been expecting the impossible. For it was the *principle* of his religion that turned out to be misleading, the principle of Legalism. Ultimately it made little difference to him in what form the principle clothed itself, whether in that of moral injunctions or ceremonial rules. Some requirements of the Law he would find easy, others hard but possible, others still for his sensitive conscience impossible. What lay behind the discord in his soul was the

conception of God which the legal system involved, and the nature of God's relation to men which was assumed in its claims. He resented, at first, no doubt, by a sort of instinct, the idea of an obedience imposed by compulsion from without, and yet that seemed to be the purpose of the only God that he knew. When he describes his own spiritual struggles, he probably refrains from deliberately uttering his innermost estimate of the Law, lest he should seem to question the wisdom of the God in whom he had never ceased to believe. In Christ his view of God was revolutionised. He had been mistaken in his earlier conception. But the Law was there, bound up with the history of that people through whom God had most clearly spoken. He did not venture to say that the human element was far stronger in Legalism than the Divine. Perhaps he could not have formulated such a statement. But those later utterances to which I have referred are evidence that he took refuge in dissociating Legalism from God, and connecting it with a lower spiritual order, which God has finally to abolish.

In the light of these considerations, his descriptions of his own attitude to the Law, whether as a Pharisee or as a Christian, gain in interest and significance.

I. *His pre-Christian attitude.*

(*a*) In the order of experience, the first moment which he singles out in his relation to the Law is that described in Romans vii. 7–11 : " I should never have known the meaning of sin but for the law : for example, I should never have come to understand evil desire unless the law had said, Thou shalt not lust. For sin, finding its starting point in the commandment, produced in me every kind of evil desire. For, apart from the law, sin has no vitality. Now formerly I myself, out of relation to the law, enjoyed life. But once the commandment reached me, sin recovered vitality and I died. Thus the commandment which had life

in view actually turned out to be death for me. For sin, finding its starting-point in the commandment, deceived me, and by means of that commandment killed me." It seems fairly clear from the wording of this passage that its form has been influenced by the story of the Fall in Genesis ii. and iii. There the serpent makes the commandment the starting-point of the temptation to disobey, deceives the woman, and brings death upon the human pair. But the Apostle, of course, assumes in his own case that sin was already there and only dormant. Perhaps he recalls a special phase of his experience in which the conflict between higher and lower took for the first time an acute shape. There is, in any case, no need to look in the passage for a complete account of his spiritual history, and so to be confronted with the difficulty of a period in which conscience had not yet begun to operate. He generalises from various experiences in order to mark a crisis in his own religious career. His clear vision of a divinely-appointed standard of conduct provokes resentment. Desire for what is forbidden rages within : sin gains the upper hand : he dies, that is, loses touch with all that makes life worth having, is separated from God, and sinks into shame and despair. But how can this be ? Has the Law been established merely to mock human aspiration ? Here we get a glimpse of his mental wrestle with an age-long problem, which ultimately is none other than that of the existence of evil. He has to approach it from his Jewish premisses. One thing stands sure. The Law is divine. Has he not, as a devout Pharisee, sung its praises again and again ? Has he not daily offered thanks to God for this unspeakable gift ? Why, then, should its claims drive him into misery ? What can be its real function for his religious life ?

(*b*) His main answer, possibly adopted temporarily to relieve his distressful situation in his Jewish period, and

probably elaborated at a later time, is obscurely hinted at in Galatians iii. 19 : " Why has the law been established ? It was interpolated (προσετέθη : Moff.) for the sake of transgressions." This compressed statement is elucidated by several passages in Romans. The most decisive is Romans vii. 13 : " Did that which was meant for my good prove fatal to me ? Never ! It was sin ; sin resulted in death for me by making use of this good thing. This was how sin was to be revealed in its true nature : it was to use the command to become sinful in the extreme " (Moff.). The same position is quite briefly stated in Romans v. 20 : " The law came in by a side door (παρεισῆλθεν) that transgression might be aggravated." And a wider aspect of this estimate appears in Romans iii. 19, where, after compiling a catena of Old Testament passages on the universality of sin among Jews as well as Gentiles, he concludes : " Now we know that all that the law says it intends for those within its scope, in order that every mouth may be shut and the whole world made to feel its guilt in God's sight." Paul therefore adopted as a working hypothesis the idea that the function of the Law, in the Divine purpose, was to intensify the consciousness of sin, to make the conscience more sensitive to all breaches of the Divine order, and thus to humble the sinner in the presence of God.

(*c*) But is that all that can be said ? For a zealous Jew such an explanation could be in no sense complete. His fundamental religious presupposition was the conviction that his relation to the Law determined his entire future in the eyes of the Almighty. Must not his intensified consciousness of sin make him all the more eager to listen to the commands and prohibitions of the Law ? Otherwise, what could he hope for ? Perhaps it is not too fanciful to suppose that this may have been the point reached in his spiritual career when Paul set himself to extirpate the sect

of the Nazarenes and so win special merit in the sight of God, the Judge of all. Was this his final attempt to vindicate Judaism to his own mind? If so, we have his personal testimony to the result. It takes the same form in several well-known passages, which suggests that the formulation of it marked an epoch in the history of his inner life. Noteworthy is the fact that it is based on an Old Testament prayer, Psalm cxliii. 2: "Enter not into judgment with thy servant: for in thy sight shall no man living be justified." There are many adumbrations of the thought in the Old Testament, e.g., Job ix. 2. Perhaps Paul boldly identifies the Psalmist with his own position, as a man who had striven with all his might under the existing religious order to establish a claim on God's final approval, and had failed to satisfy his conscience that he could in any way count upon it. At any rate he does not hesitate to add to the statement the words ἐξ ἔργων νόμου, which adapt it at once to his case. In one place he introduces it as an inference from the proof he has constructed out of Old Testament affirmations, that the entire world stands liable to God's condemnation. "For," he continues, "as the result of the works of the law "no living man shall be justified in his sight, because by means of the law comes a clear knowledge of sin" (Rom. iii. 20). Plainly he had searched the Old Testament in his experience of restlessness and despair. His use of the quotation in Galatians ii. 16 is equally significant. Here he bases upon it a broad appeal to Peter and to other Jewish Christians who had become confused as to the essence of the Gospel. "We are Jews by descent and not 'sinners of the Gentiles.' But having come to recognise that a man is not justified as the result of the works of the law, and only through faith in Christ Jesus, we too put our faith in Christ Jesus . . . for as the result of the works of the law no man living shall be justified." When, precisely, this

all-important recognition took shape in his mind, we cannot tell. But it must have been one of the most potent influences in preparing him to receive and understand the revelation of God in Christ.

(*d*) Nevertheless, as he looked back on the strange process through which he had passed, he was not yet ready to pronounce the Law inherently futile in the matter of salvation. It seems difficult to determine whether the further elucidation of its ineffectiveness which he offers suggested itself in his pre-Christian days or whether it was a later attempt to escape from a dilemma which still oppressed his mind. But one is inclined to believe that it flashed upon him while he was still struggling to reach the light, and took more definite shape when he could place it in the perspective of his Christian experience. This view is perhaps corroborated by the affinity of his explanation to that examined under (*b*). Indeed, it is first hinted at in that very context. "We know," he says, "that the law is spiritual, but I am fleshly, a complete slave of sin" (Rom. vii. 14). He does not, however, work out the contrast at that point, but reserves fuller discussion for Romans viii. 2, 3. Here his positive Christian experience supplies the framework for his elucidation. "The principle (*νόμος*) of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus set me [v.l. thee] free from the principle of sin and death. For when the law was baffled, when its power failed through the influence of the flesh, God sent his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh to deal with sin, and thus condemned sin in the flesh in order that the statutes of the law might be fulfilled in us who walk not according to the flesh but according to the Spirit." Only the second and third clauses concern us. Here is a possible explanation. And it is of an extraordinary character when we remember Paul's presuppositions. The Law was baffled in its aim of enabling men to attain righteousness in God's sight and

so gain His verdict of acquittal, by the power of sinful human nature, as Paul knows it in his working experience (= σάρξ). If the irrational bias to sin had not been there, the Law would have achieved its purpose. "If," as he elsewhere puts it, "a law able to create life (ζωοποιῆσαι) had been given, then certainly the right relation to God would have sprung from the law" (Gal. iii. 21) This last statement discloses a deeply-rooted doubt in Paul's mind. It seems to suggest that the Law in its very essence was impotent. And as we shall see, that was his final conviction. But in the passage under review he does not go so far. Sin, then, is to blame for the Law's failure. Yet the admission that human sin so completely foiled what was a Divine method that a new way of salvation had to be adopted, makes clear that Paul was taking ground which he could not permanently hold. To all intents and purposes this could be no more than a temporary and inadequate position. The earlier, incidental utterance, quoted above (Gal. iii. 21), indicates the direction in which his thoughts were moving.

(*e*) Hence we are not surprised to find the Apostle declaring that his experience of the Law was instrumental in impelling him to look for religious satisfaction from some altogether different source. He does not dwell upon the subject, but the reference to it in one of the most notable summaries of his spiritual history shows how integral an element it formed in his recollection. "I," he asserts, "by means of the law died to the law that I might live to God" (Gal. ii. 19). Probably those scholars are right, who would associate with such a statement the words which occur in the story of his conversion as given in Acts xxvi. 14: "Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me? It is hard for thee to kick against the goads." Whether this is an authentic tradition of Paul's words or not, it indicates an impression closely connected with his supreme crisis by the early Christian

community. It must certainly have meant a severe conflict for a nature like Paul's to find himself slowly but surely forced away from that standing-ground for which at one time he would have sacrificed his very life.

II. *His Christian attitude.*

I have already pointed out the risk of attempting to draw a sharp distinction between Paul's later Jewish and his Christian attitude towards the Law. The only direct evidence we have belongs to his Christian period, and it was inevitable that he should read back Christian feelings and impressions into the account he gives of his spiritual unrest. Still, it seemed legitimate to try to connect important moments in the struggle with steps in his preparation for Christ. We are on much surer ground when we review the influence of his conversion on his relation to the Law. As the result of what he has discovered in Christ, there are certain central statements he can make which, whether he has reflected on all that they involve or not, must finally lead him far beyond the position that the Law has proved inadequate for salvation. It remains to be seen whether he deliberately faced the issue.

It may be said at once that the two fundamental features in Paul's new conception of salvation, Faith and the Cross of Christ, compel from him a definite estimate of the Law.

(*a*) Faith, in its true Pauline sense of complete personal surrender to Christ, determines his entire outlook on the relation of man to God. When he brings this attitude to bear on the Law he has no hesitation in showing where he stands: "The law," he says, "has nothing to do with faith: its principle is, The man who performs these things shall live because of them" (Gal. iii. 12). And again, "If heirship [to God's promises] come by the law, faith is emptied of meaning and the divine promise cancelled" (Rom. iv. 14). Here is an overwhelming defect in the old order. It has no

concern with that religious energy or receptivity through which all the supreme things in salvation have been imparted to Paul's spiritual life. So its very rationale is, from his standpoint, an aberration. It is untrue to something central in the nature and purpose of God. A position like this admits of no such qualifications as those which we have already discussed. There is nothing to be said in this connexion as to human sin thwarting the proper action of the Law. The latter, thus estimated, could never have achieved that which has been accomplished through Faith.

(*b*) A similar situation is disclosed when the Law is set over against the Cross of Christ. "I refuse," says Paul, "to do away with the grace of God, for if the right relation to him is reached through the law, then Christ died for nothing" (Gal. ii. 21). The Cross, in one supreme aspect of it, is the exhibition of the Divine grace, the revelation of the profoundest motive in the mind of God in His dealings with men. It demonstrates that primarily salvation is a gift to men, not a wage earned (Rom. v. 8). So there is no longer room for the Law in the Divine order. "Christ is the end of the law in the matter of attaining righteousness for every believer" (Rom. x. 4). Statutory religion is seen to be a failure in the light of Christ, in whom God gives Himself to mankind. One is inclined to believe that in view of the Cross and all that that had meant for his personal experience, Paul was led to pass far severer strictures on the Law than had ever crossed his mind at an earlier time. In his later Jewish days, while perplexed and confused by the *impasse* which he had reached, his impulse was to blame something in himself, and not the theory which had regulated his religious aspirations. As a Christian, the spiritual freedom and spontaneity in which he exults, the "sonship" for which he has exchanged his "bondage," belong to a rediscovery of God. And it is not the God of Legalism into

whose face he looks, but " the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ." So he recognises that his *doctrine* has been wrong : in some connexions wholly wrong, in others, it may be, a dim approximation to the right. While we are dealing with this aspect of the situation, it is perhaps natural to ask : Did Paul hold that nothing but Christ the crucified could have taken the place of the Law, in the sense of exposing its impotence, and supplying what it lacked ? We must notice later his emphasis on an important element in Old Testament religion, independent of the Law. But probably when doubts as to the adequacy of Legalism began to insinuate themselves on the ground of his experience, the legalistic conception of God and of salvation so dominated the entire religious atmosphere in which he moved that no modification of his original position, no adaptation of the Pharisaic standpoint, would have satisfied his yearnings, nothing but a new beginning, determined by new presuppositions. That is suggested by the famous exclamation of Romans vii. 24 f. : " O wretched man that I am, who shall deliver me from this body of death ? God will ! Thanks be to him through Jesus Christ our Lord " (second clause = Moff.).

The antithesis between salvation through the Law and salvation in Christ is represented with special sharpness in those passages which speak of " dying " to the Law in Christ. This is a somewhat complex idea, and touches one of those constructions by which Paul attempts to interpret the meaning of the Cross. In his interpretation, experience and inherited theory are blended together. As the result of the crisis on the road to Damascus, he found himself transferred from the old sphere of statutory obligations into the new one of spiritual freedom and spontaneous obedience. His loyalty to the will of God was no longer a matter of compulsion but of inspiration. " The love of Christ con-

strains me" (2 Cor. v. 14). But when he endeavours to reach a *rationale* of the wonderful process by which this new kind of relation to God has been made possible, he has recourse to various explanations which have their roots partly in his Jewish postulates, partly in his sense of a Divine order. One such postulate comes out in Romans vii. 1 : "The law has authority over a man as long as he is alive." The full force of the statement is disclosed by Romans vi. 7 : "The man who is dead has been justified from sin" : i.e., sin can no more claim his allegiance, and the Law can pronounce no further condemnation on him for violating it, because its condemnation is death as a doom with no hope in it. Now, argues Paul, Christ in dying submitted to that condemnation. He submitted to the death of the Cross on which the Law had pronounced a curse (Deut. xxi. 23, quoted in Gal. iii. 13). But He did this as Substitute and Representative of the humanity with which He had identified Himself. And in Him who was sinless, the principle of sin inherent in humanity was judged and condemned (2 Cor. v. 21 ; Rom. viii. 3). But for Christ, death was the gate of life. The Law had no further claim upon Him. He had satisfied its claims in dying. Sin had no further rights in Him. But that was not the whole story. He rose again and demonstrated His triumph over sin and death. This triumph is a token that a break has been made in the old constitution of things. Or, rather, the character and purpose of God have been disclosed on new lines. Paul's well-known position is that those who by faith are united to Christ share in all His victorious experiences, avail themselves of God's fresh self-revelation. Thus he can say : "You were made dead to the law through the [crucified] body of Christ, that you might belong to another, even him who was raised from the dead" (Rom. vii. 4). One element, then, in this argument is that Christ, and in fellowship with Him, His

followers, have passed out of the realm of the Law for ever.

But why should Paul lay emphasis on Christ's vicarious reparation for the violation of the Law, made in the death of the Cross ? No doubt because the Law *in a sense* still represented to his mind the Divine order, the moral constitution of things. No other position was tenable in view of the belief handed down from his fathers that the Old Testament was literally the revealed will of God, and that until Christ came it could nowhere else be found. As a matter of fact, two conflicting principles were operating in his mind. On the one hand he had become convinced from experience that religion conceived as a system of moral and ritual precepts demanding men's obedience on pain of retribution was quite inadequate to satisfy the spiritual nature of man. Yet, on the other, he felt none the less sure of a moral constitution of the universe, reflecting the nature of God, which had somehow come to take partial shape in this practically inadequate embodiment. He never directly discusses the relation of the one to the other. That would have been almost impossible without a theory of religious development foreign to the ancient mind. But here and there we find very significant hints. " The law came in by a side door " (Rom. v. 20) ; " the law was interpolated " (Gal. iii. 19). Perhaps most remarkable of all is his indication that in the religion of the Old Testament as exhibited in the life of the patriarchs there appears a strain wholly independent of the Law. God's dealings with Abraham had nothing of a legal basis. Divine *promises* were given which Abraham, through the power of his faith, gladly accepted (Gal. iii. 16, 18 ; Rom. iv. 13, 20 f.). This gracious relationship could not be invalidated by the Law, " which arose 430 years later " (Gal. iii. 17). Here by the force of sheer spiritual insight, Paul, in his own fashion, anticipates the verdict of modern investigation, that Legalism was not

the original basis of the religion of Israel. There has been, therefore, from the beginning, a divinely-constituted order in which God reveals Himself to faith and re-acts against unbelief which means the ignoring of His being and will. Righteousness, the right relation of man to God, which is the aim of the moral order, is attained by faith (Rom. iv. 3–11, etc.): unrighteousness, the wrong relation, issues in disobedience (Rom. v. 19). A peculiarly interesting passage is that in which Paul, on the basis of these positions, upholds the existence of Law in the sense of the divinely-appointed system of religion as contained in the Old Testament and, no doubt, primarily in the Pentateuch. He has argued that faith is the only ground of acceptance in God's sight, and then he asks: "Do we in that case annul the law by means of faith?" "Far from it," he replies, "we really set it up" (Rom. iii. 31). These words have the same large sense as those of Jesus about "fulfilling" (πληρῶσαι) the Law (Matt. v. 17). As the remainder of Matthew v. shows, this fulfilment involves the deepening of many moral obligations (v. 21, 22, 28, 31 f., etc.), the abrogation of some belonging to a lower level (v. 38 ff., 43 ff.), the heightening of the entire ethical standard (v. 20). So, for Paul, "setting up" the Law means placing the emphasis on these elements in the moral constitution of things, such as the incomparable worth of faith, which represent the main current of the Divine purpose disclosed in the Old Testament, the authoritative document for religion. It is the Law in that wide aspect which is vindicated in the death of Christ, vindicated in the sense of proclaiming "with unmistakable clearness that with sin God can hold no terms" (Rom. iii. 25, see Denney's note). Here certainly Paul distinguishes between the Law as a system of detailed commandments and the Old Testament proclamation of God as establishing a claim on men's moral nature.

(*c*) When we remember the commanding place taken in Paul's religion by the Holy Spirit, we are not surprised to find him drawing a strong contrast between life under the law and life in the Spirit. Indeed, in this antithesis, the transition from the old atmosphere to the new appears in its most conspicuous form. Under the Law, Paul was above all else oppressed by a sense of helplessness. As a Christian, the distinguishing mark of his inner life is the consciousness of power. This power he identifies with possession of the Spirit. Hence, when he makes an appeal to his Galatian converts, who were in danger of being allured into Legalism, he takes as his basis precisely this element in their experience. "Let me ask you this," he says, "did you receive the Spirit because you obeyed the commands of the law or because you trusted the Gospel message" (Gal. iii. 2)? The question implies that the endowment of the Spirit is poles asunder from the toil of legal effort. The divergence he characterises in the pregnant phrase (Rom. vii. 6) which sets "the newness of the Spirit" (*καινότητι πνεύματος*) over against "the oldness of the letter" (*παλαιότητι γράμματος*). No words could better express the difference between the tyranny of an inherited code and the buoyant energy of a new life. He goes even further in 2 Corinthians iii. 6–9, which describes the two systems of religion under which he has lived. The one he calls "the administration of death which was engraved in letters of stone," the other, "the administration of the Spirit." For "the written law kills, but the Spirit makes alive." The one is "the administration that condemned," the other, "the administration that acquits." To the one belonged "a fading glory," to the other a glory which is "transcendent" (Moff.).

(*d*) The completeness of the religious transformation which has been accomplished appears from Paul's estimate of the new moral order established through Christ. The

passing of the old has not meant ethical chaos. The sheer objectivity of the legal system has not made way for a loosely subjective attitude towards moral obligations. Paul, no doubt, can speak of himself, when describing his missionary methods (1 Cor. ix. 21), as becoming to those who possessed no law " like one of themselves " (Moff.), yet he limits his assertion by adding : " though I am not outside God's law but subject to the law of Christ." The closing words are significant. Their meaning becomes clear in the light of other statements. " Bear one another's burdens," he urges the Galatians, " and so fulfil the law of Christ " (Gal. vi. 2). " Incur no debt to any one," he exhorts the Roman Christians, " except that of mutual love : for the man who loves his fellows has fulfilled the law. All the commandments without exception—Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not kill, Thou shalt not steal, Thou shalt not covet—all are summed up in the one—Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. Love never injures a neighbour, therefore love is the fulfilment of the law " (Rom. xiii. 8–10). In these utterances he reveals his intimate moral affinity with Jesus. Jesus has led him into an atmosphere where codes and lists of regulations are irrelevant. If anything here is to be called binding, it is that spirit, that temper, for which rules can no more be laid down than they can be for the mirth of little children or the singing of birds.

III. *Inferences as to the Law from his Christian experience.*

We began by examining positions of Paul which in germ at least may have been taking shape in his later pre-Christian career. We passed on to those which were the outcome of his contact with Christ. Let us, finally, consider certain inferences from the standpoint he has reached, some of which seem to link themselves to intuitions that already flashed upon his mind in the midst of his spiritual struggles in Judaism.

(*a*) We have seen, under I (*b*), that one way in which Paul attempted to explain the purpose of the Law was to assign to it the function of intensifying men's consciousness of sin. This is the kind of explanation to which he may well have felt himself drawn when he discovered the full extent of his powerlessness to fulfil its requirements. In the light of Christ the explanation receives a new meaning. "Before the era of faith (*τὴν πίστιν*) arrived, we were kept in strict ward under the law, to prepare us for the faith which was destined to be revealed. The law, therefore, has been our slave-tutor (*παιδαγωγός*) to prepare us for Christ, so that we might be justified by faith. But now that the era of faith has arrived, we are no longer under a slave-tutor. For you are all sons of God through faith in Christ Jesus" (Gal. iii. 23–26).

Here we have a unique glimpse of the penetration of the Apostle's thought. It is doubtful whether any thinkers of his time had so remarkable a vision of what we have come to call the philosophy of history. The province is, of course, the history of religion. But that is no disparagement to the boldness of the thought. Paul has become aware that Law cannot be an end in itself, that its task is merely disciplinary, to mould human life for an ideal stage in which its work becomes unnecessary. He was convinced that the ideal stage had arrived in Christ: that the epoch of spiritual freedom had dawned, a freedom which should find its only limit in love (Gal. v. 13), that power which is the very opposite of law (Gal. v. 22, 23). In his illustration he plainly emphasises the inferiority of the earlier era. The tutor is after all only a slave. His authority over his ward is temporary. The day must come when the ward attains his majority. Then the slave must abdicate his office.

(*b*) This idea of the inferiority of the Law could only be formulated by Paul after he had entered upon the larger

life of the Spirit. In his inner conflict under Judaism he had grown conscious of the powerlessness of the Law to satisfy his craving for harmony with God, but there was no higher economy of salvation with which he could compare it. As soon as he discovered the real nature of God in Christ, he was bound to disparage that phase of religion which mocked him. And then all sorts of disadvantages attaching to the Law began to impress his mind. There was a Jewish *theologoumenon*, reflected in the LXX text of Deuteronomy xxiii. 2, which assigned the actual promulgation of the Law to angels (see Schoettgen and Wetstein on Galatians iii. 19). This was, of course, intended to enhance the glory of the Law-giving, as we can discover even from the address of the Christian Jew, Stephen (Acts vii. 53). Paul turns the tables on his opponents and wins the idea (*διαταγεὶς δι' ἀγγέλων*) to detract from the dignity of the Law as compared with the revelation of grace in Jesus Christ (Gal. iii. 19). In the same vein of detraction he refers to Moses as the medium of the legal dispensation (*loc. cit.*). This was an extraordinarily daring turn of the argument, for Moses, of course, stood in a unique position of honour in Judaism, as the friend and confidante of the Almighty. Perhaps one may venture on the suggestion that in his earlier writings Paul had been troubled because of the place occupied by Moses in the religious constitution of Israel: that he had felt the need of some more direct assurance of the Divine will. He might scarcely allow the feeling to take a concrete shape for his own mind. But it is noteworthy that he never magnifies the position of Moses in the history of the religion of Israel. His attitude stands in marked contrast with that of his fellow-Hellenist Stephen and that of the writer to the Hebrews. In Stephen's address (Acts vii. 20 ff.), and throughout the Epistle to the Hebrews, Moses is exalted as the commanding figure in the earlier religious life

of the nation. In Paul's Epistles he is completely overshadowed by Abraham, the great *believer* (τῷ πιστῷ Ἀβραάμ). Perhaps his conception of Moses is reflected in such a statement as Romans x. 5: "Moses writes concerning the righteousness that depends on the law: "The man who performs it shall live by it.".

We have further light on his conception of angels as concerned with the system of Legalism. In Galatians iv. 4 Paul describes the inadequate condition of tutelage under the Law as "enslavement to the elemental spirits of the world" (ὑπὸ τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου . . . δεδουλωμένοι). The words τὰ στοχεῖα have usually been rendered "the rudiments," and that rendering cannot be pronounced impossible. But the early Greek exegetes of the Church, Chrysostom, Theodore of Mopsuestia, and others, interpret them as the elements of the universe in the widest sense, sun, moon, stars, planets, etc., and they point out that the sacred feasts of the Jews, as of the Pagan world, were regulated by the movements of the heavenly bodies. Now we know from the apocalyptic literature of Judaism that all the forces of nature were regarded as having their "angels" or "spirits" (see the Christian Apocalypse vii. 1, xiv. 18, xvi. 5). Various statements in Philo seem to suggest that there was actually a Jewish worship of the elements (e.g. *Quis rer. div. hom.* 280 ff., and see Bréhier, *Les Idées Philosophiques et Religieuses de Philon*, p. 163). Probably the tendency was fostered by the current Hellenistic ideas, elaborated by the Stoics and having close affinity with popular astrology, that the spirits of the elemental bodies have a direct influence on the life of men (cf. Seneca, *Ep.* 117, 23: "*Elementa quibus hic mundus administratur*").[1] Paul is fond of using

[1] For an excellent statement of evidence in favour of the interpretation of τὰ στοιχεῖα given in the text, see Deissmann's article, *Elements*, in *Encycl. Biblica*.

conceptions which he can apply both to the Jewish and the Gentile world. Thus his frequent arguments concerning the Law in letters addressed to predominantly Gentile communities are not meant exclusively to be a defence of his Christian standpoint against Judaism. He is quite aware that for Pagans also religion was largely a matter of custom and prescribed ritual, and that a primary motive in it was fear rather than love. So that an attack on Legalism was strictly relevant to their traditions and environment. Similarly in the case of τὰ στοιχεῖα, he finds a category under which he can group both Jewish and Gentile worship. No doubt he would refuse to place the respective cults on the same level. But, roughly speaking, he classifies them together in this particular aspect, and with bold emphasis. For the passage quoted above is followed by one much more explicit. "In those days, when you were ignorant of God, you were in servitude to gods who are really no gods at all; but now that you know God—or rather, are known by God—how is it that you are turning back again to the weakness and poverty of the elemental spirit? Why do you want to be enslaved all over again by them? You observe days and months and festal seasons and years" (Gal. iv. 8–13, Moff.). To bind themselves to the Jewish Law is nothing more or less than to return to this old heathen ritual. For behind the festivals of Jewish Legalism may be discerned those angelic powers to whom homage is really done.

Here is an extraordinary elaboration of the passing hint in Galatians iii. 19. It is difficult to suppose that it is simply a daring and far-fetched attempt of the Apostle's to cast further discredit on the Law. His thought has a deeper basis. Its true significance comes out in the light of various passages in Colossians. In i. 16 Christ is exalted as the essential principle of creation, of the creation of the universe

in its widest sense, as embracing "all things in the heavens and on earth, the visible and the invisible, whether thrones or lordships or powers or authorities." These expressions are identical with the description of the angelic forces in the Jewish apocalypses. A nearer glimpse of these dim hierarchies is given in ii. 8–10, where the theosophy urged upon the Colossian Christians is said to take for its standard "the elemental spirits of the world and not Christ." Plainly they were being thrust forward as spiritual media through whom God can be known. So, over against them, Paul places Christ, in whom "dwells the entire fulness of Deity in organised form," a created historical Person, and no impalpable shadow. Nay more. Christ is "the head of every power and authority" (*πάσης ἀρχῆς καὶ ἐξουσίας* = *τὰ στοιχεῖα*). Not only was He "before" them in the Divine order. But His victory over sin and death was a victory over them also, as the guardians of that old legal régime, which could exhibit sin to men and could condemn them to sin's penalty, death, but was utterly inadequate to bring salvation. Thus, in Him (or, in the Cross) God has stripped them off their helpless victims: He has exposed them publicly in their true character: He has triumphed over them [1] (Col. ii. 15). And accordingly, all who have entered into fellowship with Christ may be said to have died to these elemental powers (ii. 20: *ἀπεθάνετε σὺν Χριστῷ ἀπὸ τῶν στοιχείων τοῦ κόσμου*). There is no mere "worship of angels" for them. Their life has been hid with Christ in God.

Such statements show how far the Apostle has travelled in his attitude towards the Law from his pre-Christian days.

[1] It is highly probable that we should connect with these statements those of 1 Cor. ii. 6, 8, which ascribe the crucifixion of Jesus to *οἱ ἄρχοντες τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου*, who would thus represent *τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου* and *αἱ ἀρχαὶ καὶ αἱ ἐξουσίαι*. The identification is of extraordinary significance, especially if we further compare Eph. vi. 12.

There is nothing now to qualify his uncompromising opposition. Growing experience of Christ has cast into a darker shadow all that seems to compete with Him for men's allegiance. The Epistle to the Colossians, belonging to the closing group of his Letters, seems indeed to indicate a real development in his estimate of the Law. And although here the ascetic side of Legalism occupies the foreground, I scarcely think we are at liberty to isolate this element from Paul's conception of Law as a whole. What he really has in view is *δόγματα*, the rules and regulations which constitute the Law (cf. the description in 3 Maccab. i. 3 of Dositheos, an apostate from Judaism, as *μεταβαλὼν τὰ νόμιμα καὶ τῶν πατρίων δογμάτων ἀπηλλοτριωμένος*). This comes out in two passages from the final group of his Epistles.

(1) In describing all that God has done for His people through Christ crucified, risen and exalted, Paul specifies His " having obliterated the bond for which we were liable, consisting in ordinances (*δόγματα*), that bond which menaced us." This " he completely removed, by nailing it to the cross " (Col. ii. 14). There is no hint here that the Law has any quality to commend it. Its inherent principle is faulty. It is something which must be shown up and got rid of once for all. Its existence is incompatible with the forgiveness of sin. And so, like its sponsors, the *ἀρχαί* and *ἐξουσίαι*, it is cast aside for ever.

(2) But the Law is not only a menace to individuals, which must wither up in presence of the sunshine of the love of God. It is a hindrance to the realisation of the Divine purpose in its widest scope. As Paul continued to brood over the operation of the Divine wisdom, he became more and more overpowered by the vision that dawned upon his soul, the abolishing of all prerogatives, racial and religious, in so far as they made access to God the privilege of a restricted circle. To retain such barriers was to stultify the work of

Christ. Hence he exults in the conception of his Lord as the Peace of mankind. That means that He made the two great divisions of humanity, as Paul regarded them, Jews and Gentiles, into a single, glorious brotherhood. This He did by breaking down "the barriers which kept us apart." "In his own flesh he put an end to the feud (ἔχθρα) of the law with its code of commands . . . giving the death-blow to that feud by the Cross" (Eph. ii. 14–16, mainly Moff.). But the abolishing of the Law has a far-reaching twofold effect. While it removes the fundamental obstacle to a mutual understanding between Jews and Gentiles, it achieves an even higher result. It bestows upon each section alike free access through the power of the one Spirit into the immediate presence of the Father. That, for St. Paul, is the final goal of humanity.

H. A. A. Kennedy.

TITUS THE FRIEND OF LUKE, AND OTHER RELATED QUESTIONS.

In his interesting paper "Some considerations on the Pastoral Epistles" the Rev. E. F. Brown of Calcutta has revived in these pages several questions bearing both on the Pauline Epistles and on Acts. On various points he has made out a good case; e.g., as regards the weakening of the linguistic argument against the Pauline authorship of the Pastorals, and the exegesis of some difficult words [1] and phrases in those epistles.

Touching these matters I would add only two remarks in passing. First, the best rendering of καλῶν ἔργων προΐστασθαι seems to be, not "*take the lead in* good (noble) works," but rather "practise honourable occupations" (comp. Field, *Otium Norvicense*, iii. *ad loc.*), or "follow" such—according to another metaphor than προΐστασθαι, *prostare*, in the sense of standing in front of one's place of business. I can see in the context of Titus iii. 8, 14, no allusion to the lower standard in such works "of the society around" the Christian brotherhood. Next, Mr. Brown refers to myself as holding "that room must be found for the Pastoral Epistles in St. Paul's life before his first captivity at Rome." In point of fact my present view [2] is far nearer his own than he supposes, and is in perfect accord with his linguistic findings, since I assign the Pastorals to Paul's (one) Roman imprisonment—1 Timothy and Titus to its first part; 2 Timothy to its close. If he cares to turn to the series of papers in the Expositor (vol. i.) for 1913, which contains

[1] As to κνηθόμενοι, Jerome's rendering *pruricntes* should be noted as favouring "itching," [as A.V. and R.V.

[2] See art. "Paul" in the *Encyclopædia Britannica* (11th ed.) and the Expositor for 1913, i. 325 ff.

my "Retractations" on the Pastoral Epistles, he will perhaps come also to doubt whether the case for Paul's release is not stronger than he supposes. It is surely a slip in chronology to argue that "it was still . . . the 'golden quinquennium' of Nero" when Paul's appeal case lay in his Appeal Court for decision: it was rather the time when Poppæa was growing in influence; and she was apt to make her sympathies with Judaism felt through Nero. And, once more, it is not a mere matter of giving to the confidence of Philippians i. 25 (whatever its kind and degree, especially in view of ii. 17, "Yea, and if I am being offered up," etc.), "equal weight" with Paul's words at Miletus to the opposite effect:[1] "I know that ye all shall see my face no more" (Acts xx. 25). What one has to reckon with chiefly is Luke's own emphasising of them just below (*v.* 38), in his comment on the passionate sorrow of those to whom they were addressed. Thereby he seems to imply that they were in fact fulfilled.

But my main object in taking up Mr. Brown's paper as affording subject for further discussion, is (1) to query the exact form of the special bond which he rightly recognises as existing between Luke and Titus; (2) to try to define it more accurately; (3) to trace the probable parts played at the time in question by Timothy and Tychicus respectively; and (4) to show the bearing of these results upon some literary problems of 2 Corinthians and Acts.

1. Mr. Brown quotes with approval the words of the late W. H. Simcox: "From 2 Corinthians viii. 18, xii. 18, one is led to conjecture that he (Titus) was an elder brother of St. Luke." That Luke was "the brother whose praise in

[1] I cannot think that Mr. Brown's view of "you all," in its emphatic position at the end of the sentence in Greek, as meaning: "There are *some* of you who will not see me again," can possibly hold good, grammatically or otherwise.

the Gospel is throughout all the churches " has been widely recognised, and may here perhaps be taken for granted without further argument. But that he and Titus were brothers is another matter altogether, and the case for it has no real weight. To say that *συνεπέμψαμεν δὲ τὸν ἀδελφὸν μετ' αὐτοῦ οὗ ὁ ἔπαινος ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ διὰ πασῶν τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν* " is most naturally translated ' we sent his brother with him,' " is simply to fly in the face at any rate of the usage of the New Testament. Mr. Brown indeed writes : " Though ' brethren ' is a common word for Christians,' ' the brother ' could scarcely stand alone as meaning a Christian." That is a surprising assertion, and is backed up by another as surprising, viz., that " the only instance in which it appears to do so is in Romans xvi. 23."

One need hardly stay to discuss his view here, which I think quite untenable, that we should translate, " Erastus . . . and Quartus his brother "—where Moffatt's " our brother " gives the right sense—and that in fact " we have Gaius, Erastus, Tertius, and Quartus as the four brothers of the family by whom St. Paul was entertained at Corinth." It is true that he has the support of Professor A. Souter [1] in rendering " Quartus *his* brother," as well as in his argument touching Luke as Titus' brother in 2 Corinthians viii. 18. Were it a matter of pure Greek scholarship, this would give one more serious pause than it does on what is mainly a matter of New Testament thought and usage. But, after all, the very address of 2 Corinthians itself refutes the general principle that *ὁ ἀδελφὸς* must denote natural relationship : " Paul, an Apostle of Christ Jesus . . . and Timothy *ὁ ἀδελφὸς* " (cf. 1 Cor. i. 1, xvi. 12) : so it reads ; yet natural brotherhood is here out of the question. That the personal relationship between the two really explains the

[1] The Expositor for 1914 (viii.), pp. 95 f. ; cf. *The Expository Times*, vol. xviii.

" delicate reticence " which led Luke to suppress the name of Titus, as well as his own, in his narrative, I have long held : but that the relationship was one of blood rather than close friendship cannot be proved, least of all by such evidence.

2. But I will reserve further reference to this until after dealing with the other " brother " alluded to in the same context in 2 Corinthians, viz., in viii. 22 f. " And we have sent with them our brother, whom we have many times proved zealous in many things, but now much more zealous by reason of the great confidence which he hath in you. Whether any inquire about Titus, he is my partner and fellow-worker to you-ward ; or our brethren, they are messengers (*ἀπόστολοι*) of churches, Christ's glory." Who, then, was the zealous helper of Paul on many previous occasions ? He, like Luke, was a delegate of one or more churches in the conveyance of the collection from Paul for the poor saints in Jerusalem. And we may naturally expect that he was one of those named in Acts xx. 4 in this connexion. Of these we may eliminate the Macedonian delegates, in the light of ix. 4, " lest, if there come with me any of Macedonia, and find you unprepared, we (that we say not, ye) should be put to shame in this confidence " (viz., in the forwardness of the Corinthians). This leaves only Gaius of Derbe and Timothy from Galatia, and Tychicus and Trophimus (the Ephesian, xxi. 29) of the province of Asia. Of these Timothy is out of the question ; and Gaius is far less likely to have been Paul's oft-tested helper, or with him at this time, than the two Asians, seeing that Paul had started on his present journey from the chief city of their province. As between Tychicus and Trophimus it is harder to decide. But in view of the important *rôle* assigned to Tychicus as the bearer of the Epistles to the Colossians (iv. 7 f.) and " to Ephesians " (vi. 21 f.)—a circular letter for Asia, as it seems—

and again in Titus iii. 12, still more in 2 Timothy iv. 12, it is natural to give him the preference [1] here as the "brother" so highly commended, the third of the weighty deputation to stimulate a speedy and generous collection at Corinth.

It may now be observed that this same "brother" had seemingly much the same qualifications of special eagerness (σπουδαίοτερον) for his mission as Titus, an eagerness here traced to "much confidence" in the Corinthians. But as in Titus' case keenness to go was due to personal intercourse with them, it looks as though this brother also had gained his confidence in them and consequent eagerness in similar fashion. Now in viii. 6 Paul says that, in urging Titus to go back and help in the completion of the collection at Corinth, he had in mind the fact that "he had inaugurated" it on a former visit (cf. 1 Cor. xvi. 1). Why, then, may not that have been true also of this "brother," who was now to accompany Titus and the delegate representative not only of one church but of "the churches" generally—"all the churches" —among whom his "praise in the Gospel" was diffused? Further, in this light, is it not most likely that when in xii. 18 "the brother" (not "brethren" as in viii. 23) associated with Titus is referred to *in relation to a date prior to the reception, if not to the writing, of* 2 *Corinthians*, it is still the same person, not Luke (who was only now starting for Corinth for the first time as Titus' companion), that is confidently cited as evidence that Paul had not, even indirectly through his representatives, aimed at extracting

[1] If one is right in believing the allusion to Trophimus as having been left behind "sick at Miletus," according to 2 Tim. iv. 20, to be an aberrant item there added from another and slighter note—probably written to Timothy shortly before he joined Paul in Macedonia on this occasion—our preference will be further justified. The intrusive section found in 2 Cor. itself, viz., vi. 13–vii. 1, probably once part of the lost letter referred to in 1 Cor. v. 10 f., affords an analogy for such a view of 2 Timothy iv. 20, 21*a*, which interrupts the sequence between salutations to others at Ephesus and those to Timothy himself.

money from his converts at Corinth in a selfish and oppressive way?

Whether this inference be cogent or not, in any case the comparison of viii. 18 or 22 with xii. 18 supports the unity of chapters i.–ix., and x.–xiii., which is often called in question. The cross-reference to "the brother" seems clear and natural.

3. As to Timothy, is there any clear evidence that he actually visited Corinth alone before Titus' first visit, as is often supposed? Acts xix. 22, and 1 Corinthians iv. 17, xvi. 10, do not necessarily imply as much. In 1 Corinthians iv. 17, "I sent unto you Timothy . . . who shall put you in remembrance of my ways which are in Christ," probably refers to the same mission that is recorded in Acts xix. 22 of Timothy and Erastus "into Macedonia," there represented as meant to make up in a measure for temporary delay in Paul's own plans of going forthwith "through Macedonia and Achaia" to Jerusalem (xix. 21). Nothing in Acts suggests that Timothy really went on from Macedonia to Achaia while Paul still "stayed on in Asia for a while"; in fact the contrary. And that this was contemplated as a possibility even by Paul when he wrote 1 Corinthians iv. 17, is implied by xvi. 10, "Now if[1] (not 'when') Timothy come (to Corinth), see that he be with you without fear: for he worketh the Lord's work, as I do." The "work" here in question was probably the collection business in particular, which might bring him ultimately to Corinth with Erastus—who would naturally go on thither to hasten his own church's contribution, ere Paul came: but Timothy's own mission related primarily to Macedonia, and in fact carried him no farther (unlike Erastus, to whose

[1] ἐὰν δὲ ἔλθῃ T., βλέπετε κ.τ.λ. Ἐὰν with the conjunctive retains in N.T. Greek, if Blass, *Grammar of N.T. Greek* (1898), 214 f., may be trusted, its properly conditional force—at least in Paul, if it be not so in John iii. 2.

visit we seem to have a stray reference embedded in 2 Timothy iv. 20 : see last note). Possibly just as the change of plan on Paul's own part, implied in Acts xix. 21 f., was due to the turn of events in Corinth which evoked 1 Corinthians (cf. 2 Cor. i. 15–19); so it may have been news touching the bad way in which 1 Corinthians had been taken at Corinth (causing Paul to write a severe letter, sent by the hand of Titus, according to 2 Corinthians ii. 1–4, 12 f., vii. 5–15) which made Timothy return from Macedonia to Ephesus without going on to Corinth,[1] before Paul started thence after the trade uproar (Acts xx. 1). Thereupon Paul urged him to stay on in his stead, in order to guide the troubled local Church amid the critical conditions there obtaining (1 Tim. i. 3), seeing that the Apostle himself had to leave owing to imminent dangers (2 Cor. i. 8–11) largely personal to himself, as distinct from Timothy, who had been absent during recent events.

4. So much for the personal and literary questions connected with Corinth and Paul's letters to Corinth raised by 2 Corinthians viii. 16–24, xii. 18. But we have yet to finish off the main one as to the exact bond between Luke and Titus and its bearing on Acts, particularly its silence as to the latter. Mr. Brown seems to sum up the known facts touching Luke and Titus excellently when he writes: "Thus the evidence all points to their being fellow-Gentiles, fellow-Antiochenes, fellow-converts of the earliest days of St. Paul; and as they were among the first Gentiles to become Christians, we can understand the enthusiastic love and gratitude which led them to become the life-long companions of the great Apostle." But apart from an exegesis of 2 Corinthians viii. 18 which seems unwarranted, we are

[1] This may have added to the charge of fickleness in Paul's intentions—i.e., as regards Timothy's movements, according to 1 Cor. iv. 17, and xvi. 10, as well as his own—which is echoed in 2 Cor. i. 17–19.

not entitled to regard them as kinsmen in the flesh as well as in the spirit. They were bosom friends, inseparables [1] so far as the Lord's work allowed ; and Luke was restrained by the special bond between them, possibly by the actual presence and co-operation of Titus when Acts was composed, from referring to his *alter ego* any more than to himself.

While, however, I believe that Titus and Luke were "fellow-Antiochenes," I demur to any citation of the Bezan reading of Acts xi. 27 to prove this directly, as though it belonged to a "we" section of Acts. It seems sounder to take the words *συνεστραμμένων δὲ ἡμῶν* as secondary, a gloss added (like certain others in this part of the work) by some member of the Antiochene church, possibly in the official copy of Acts used for reading in public worship. Indirectly it may imply that it was felt to be appropriate to a narrative written by Luke : but no more. On the other hand I would venture to carry a little further the suggestion that Titus "had acted as dragoman" to Paul and Barnabas "after Mark's departure," by asking whether the traces of eyewitness in the story of that Mission journey, and even some of its phrasing, may not be due to Titus, echoed by his friend Luke. This might come about through the medium either of notes taken down from Titus' lips on his return to Antioch, or of his memories recounted afresh when Luke was composing Acts. Thus we can best explain certain very "autoptic" and detailed touches in the account of the episode with Elymas, and of the scene in the synagogue at Antioch of Pisidia ; the full notes of Paul's

[1] Mr. Brown refers to the *Acts of Paul and Thekla* in confirmation of Titus' having accompanied Paul on his first Missionary journey (with Barnabas), a fact which local tradition might well preserve, assigning to him the description of Paul's personal appearance. But the *Acts of Paul* (*c.* 160–180), of which this episode forms part, also makes Titus and Luke companions in prayer after Paul's martyrdom, as though this too was in keeping with tradition.

discourse there ; the description of the missionaries as " the Apostles " (xiv. 4, 14), and the Lystran view of them as Zeus and Hermes respectively, along with the reason for this estimate of their mutual relations ; the very exact account of the episode occasioned by the action of the priest of the special local cult of Zeus ; the account of the peculiar governmental conditions of the regions traversed, as worked out by Sir W. M. Ramsay ; the reference to " praying *with fastings* " in connexion with the appointment of " presbyters " in these Churches ; and finally the sympathetic lapse into virtual quotation of the gist of the Apostles' heartening words to their much tried converts, " through many afflictions must *we* enter into the Kingdom of God " (xiv. 22).

All or many of these features, it is suggested, may be due to the influence of Luke's *alter ego*, Titus, upon the story of Acts, in parts of which—and perhaps more than we can now discern—he was a silent actor.

VERNON BARTLET.

THE PLACE OF THE SACRAMENTS IN THE TEACHING OF ST. PAUL.

THE article with the above title in the November number, written by Professor Andrews, is of particular interest, coming from a Free Church theologian. He says that there has been a tendency in the circle he represents " to ignore the sacramental elements in the teaching of St. Paul or to assume that his views were in accord with their own." Then he proceeds to show that " the pendulum of criticism has swung in the opposite direction " during recent years. I should like to make some comments on the article from the standpoint of an Evangelical Churchman.

1. Professor Andrews says that the attack on Bruce's

position is "all the more significant because it has come from scholars who cannot be suspected of the slightest bias towards sacramentarianism." I wonder whether he has forgotten the fact that the men he mentions, Wernle, Weinel, Titius and Pfleiderer, with others, hail from the place where the Lutheran view of the sacraments has long held sway. Can we be quite sure that even the Rationalism of these men is not affected by their ecclesiastical atmosphere and associations?

2. Dr. Andrews quotes Kirsopp Lake in support of this new view, but I am inclined to think that he has not given due consideration to the criticisms that have been directed against Lake as an interpreter of St. Paul.

3. I quite agree that a very serious problem is raised for Free Church theology by the new school, "or at any rate for that section of it which has been in the habit of regarding the sacraments as merely symbolical." But this problem has existed for a very long time, and quite independently of the new school, because a careful exegesis shows that passages about the sacraments warrant neither the new interpretation nor the symbolical view which has undoubtedly been the prevailing interpretation in most Free Church circles. I believe it is capable of proof that the true view of the sacraments is neither symbolical nor in harmony with the view that Dr. Andrews favours, and I am afraid that he is all unconsciously involved in the error of supposing that there is no alternative to the two views he mentions.

4. Professor Andrews seems at first sight to agree with Weinel that there is "discrepancy between the two halves of Paulinism—the spiritual and the sacramental." Now quite apart from any apostolic inspiration, is it at all likely even on the lowest ground that a keen thinker like St. Paul would have left his position so discrepant? May

we not suppose that he could and would see the situation as easily as Weinel ?

5. Dr. Andrews interprets 1 Corinthians vi. 11 : " ye were washed " of baptism. But why should this be, especially as every other phrase in the passage is obviously spiritual ?

6. In reference to the well-known passage, 1 Corinthians xv. 29, " baptized for the dead," he actually speaks of " ingenious attempts to pervert the clear sense of a perfectly unambiguous Greek phrase." Surely this is going too far in face of the fact that some of the greatest Greek scholars are not prepared to admit that the phrase is " perfectly unambiguous." There is no trace of the custom of " vicarious baptism " anything like so early as the time of St. Paul. And besides, what are we to understand by " vicarious baptism " ? Were the people baptized twice, once for themselves and once for their dead friends ? Then, too, it is difficult to see the force of any such contention in the light of the great argument of the chapter.

7. Dr. Andrews maintains that " one Baptism " in Ephesians iv. is baptism by water. But here again he has not really faced the issue why baptism by water should be included as one of the elements of the unity of the Spirit. He allows, of course, that there is no mention of the Eucharist and no reference to the Apostolate, though it might have been supposed that these outward and visible facts would have helped the argument for unity in a very considerable way. We must, therefore, still seek a better explanation of why baptism is included in this list than that which is given by Dr. Andrews.

8. He says that the " clearest and most incontrovertible statement " about baptism is to be found in Ephesians v. 26, " cleansing it by the washing of water with the word," and he goes on to say that the statement is so categorical

that "no amount of ingenuity can eviscerate their clear meaning and significance." Is not this statement somewhat sweeping, to say the least of it? Quite apart from the question whether ἐν corresponds with the Hebrew בְּ, indicating mode or instrument, what are we to make of our Lord's words in St. John xv. 3, "Ye are clean because of the word," and St. John xvii. 16, "sanctify them in the truth"? Dr. Andrews does not seem to me to allow for the obvious truth of the cleansing efficacy of the word of God.

9. He adduces Titus iii. 5 in support of his contention, "the washing of regeneration," but it is at least open to question whether this can be strictly and literally interpreted of baptism. It is either the "washing" which regenerates us, or the "regeneration" which washes us, but in any case it refers to a spiritual act.

10. From these passages it is clear, as has already been remarked, that Dr. Andrews thinks the only alternative to the literal interpretation of these passages is the symbolic view of baptism. This may be so to certain Free Churchmen, but it is not the case to those who have been taught to give the New Testament its proper force and yet avoid both extremes.

11. Dr. Andrews' conclusion is that the Epistles of St. Paul approximate very closely to "the ecclesiastical doctrine of baptismal regeneration." But everything turns upon the meaning of the word "regeneration." It only occurs twice in the New Testament, and in one of these (Matt. xix. 28) it clearly refers to sphere. Is there not a clear distinction between *life* and *birth*, between the ideas suggested by the Latin words *generatus* and *natus*?

12. Dr. Andrews is quite clear that Romans vi. refers to the ordinance of water baptism, and says that "it creates the mystical union between the believer and Christ." But

it is worthy of remark that the crucifixion, death and resurrection in Romans vi. are all spiritual, and to introduce a literal burial in water is to impart into the exegesis an idea which does violence to the whole of the teaching. Besides, how is it possible to be "buried with a view to death" if the reference is to water-baptism, for death obviously precedes burial. The passage when read in the light of the context clearly teaches the spiritual meaning of baptism and not the literal ordinance. I do not wonder that Bruce saw that if Romans vi. is to be interpreted of baptism by water, it must of necessity mean Baptismal Regeneration in the usual modern sense, because the statement is "buried by baptism." Our Baptist friends who gloss the passage by speaking of baptism as symbolical are entirely wide of the mark, for there is not the slightest trace of symbolism in the statement or the teaching.

13. Another passage used by Professor Andrews is 1 Corinthians xii. 13, as to which he speaks of baptism as the "means by which the Christian is incorporated into the Church as the body of Christ." But he has singularly and, I think, significantly omitted the phrase, "by one Spirit are we all baptized." How is it possible for the application of water to accomplish the spiritual act of incorporating us into the body of Christ? How can that which is physical effect that which is spiritual?

14. In discussing the Eucharist Dr. Andrews rightly says that the only relevant issue is as to the meaning and function associated with the Sacraments by St. Paul. Here again, it is impossible to avoid noticing the inadequate Free Church view against which Dr. Andrews writes. This interpretation, as given by the writer of the essay in the book *Concerning Prayer*, undoubtedly falls short of the full New Testament teaching, but on the other hand it

is a question whether Dr. Andrews does not go beyond Scripture. In using 1 Corinthians x. 16–21 he renders the words "the cup of blessing which we bless, is it not a κοινωνία, participation in the blood of Christ?" It is somewhat surprising that he renders the Greek κοινωνία by "participation" instead of "partnership," more particularly because there is a Greek word for participation in the same context. But quite apart from this, to speak of the life of God being "conveyed into the life of the worshipper through the medium of the material elements" is decidedly ambiguous. What is the meaning of the words "medium" and "vehicle." Is the idea that of an electric wire or a legal deed? The strict meaning of the word "vehicle" involves the idea of some residential presence of God's life, which it would be difficult, not to say impossible, to prove from anything in St. Paul.

15. Lake is quoted here as saying that St. Paul and the Corinthians held that "the Eucharist is a rite which really conveys . . . participation in the Divine Nature." But I note that Dr. Andrews goes on to remark that Lake exaggerates the results which follow from this conclusion when he says that "the Catholic doctrine of the Eucharist is much more primitive than the Protestant." I fail to see any exaggeration in this conclusion, which seems to me to be the simple, logical outcome of the premisses which Dr. Andrews accepts. But on this question of the Eucharist in relation to heathen rites I am content to appeal to Dr. Kennedy and his convincing criticism of Lake's view.

16. Turning to 1 Corinthians xi. 29, Dr. Andrews says that the phrase "if he discern not the body" has always been a serious stumblingblock to Protestant commentators, because of their usual interpretation about not distinguishing between the sacramental elements and common food. He urges that this is "too loose a paraphrase" to be regarded

as a proper interpretation, and once again he speaks of "honest exegesis" involving a view which makes out that the Apostle held what may be called a sacramental interpretation. But it is somewhat singular that he has not given due attention to the use of the same word *ἀνακρίνω* in the immediate context, where it can only mean "judge" or "discriminate" (v. 31), and it is also curious that Dr. Andrews can say that the words of institution, "this is my body which is given for you," must refer to the heavenly, spiritual body which Christ assumed after the resurrection. It is almost amusing to see how extremes meet here, for this is the favourite idea of men of Bishop Gore's school. But, as Cranmer said, the body associated with the Lord's Supper is the body *ut in cruce non in coelo*.

17. Dr. Andrews makes a strong point of what he calls the physical as well as the spiritual effects upon the communicants at Corinth, and he maintains that verse 30 "cannot possibly refer to moral and spiritual deterioration." But no one seriously thinks it does. On the contrary, the plain and obvious meaning of the passage is that the misuse, that is, the thoughtless and irreverent use of the Lord's Supper was visited by discipline affecting the body. And why not? Then, too, how is it possible for material elements to cause illness?

18. Dr. Andrews urges that as Mark xvi. 16 insists on two conditions as necessary to salvation—faith and baptism, "we have no warrant for saying that the one is less essential than the other." But what about the opposite of salvation? In the next statement baptism is significantly omitted.

19. The use of 1 Peter iii. 21 is said to refer to baptism as the agency of salvation. But notwithstanding the attempts of Dr. Andrews to get rid of the phrase "not the putting away of the filth of the flesh," it remains clear that

the Apostle distinguishes between, while he associates together, the physical and spiritual parts.

20. He says that the climax of the New Testament statements about baptism is found in the conversation with Nicodemus, and that there seems to be no way of avoiding the decision that these words mean that baptism is absolutely essential to the Christian life. But does this follow? In the first place, the words are associated with the very beginning of our Lord's ministry, three years before Christian baptism was instituted. Then, too, if they are taken literally and universally as they stand, they must of necessity mean that no one can see and enter the Kingdom of God unless he has been baptized. I am sure Dr. Andrews does not believe this, and I am equally positive that neither our Lord nor His Apostle meant it.

21. It is not surprising that Dr. Andrews regards it as impossible "not to see an allusion to the Eucharist" in St. John vi. But here again, a little consideration of exegetical perspective ought to be a help to the right interpretation. Is it at all likely that a discourse to unbelievers, delivered at least a year before the institution of the Lord's Supper, could possibly have that ordinance in mind, especially when the latter is intended for disciples only? Then, too, we are faced once again with the absolutely universal expression "except ye eat . . . ye have no life in you" (v. 52), which, if they refer to the Lord's Supper, must mean that eternal life is only possible through partaking of the Holy Communion. The fact is that Dr. Andrews has overlooked the sweeping and unqualified statements of the three great passages in St. John commencing with "except" (ch. xii.; ch. vi.; ch. iii.). When these are taken as they stand they emphasise the great and universal necessity of our Lord's death, of our participation in the atonement and of our new birth by the Spirit. But if they

are limited to any ordinance they involve consequences too serious to contemplate. Let me beg of Dr. Andrews to look again at Westcott and others on this passage, not forgetting a valuable pamphlet by the present Bishop of Durham, which includes a remarkable comment by Ferns, the Roman Catholic writer.

22. Dr. Andrews says that if his arguments are sound " we are forced to admit that as far as exegesis is concerned the sacramentarian interpretation of Paulinism has won a decisive victory and the Symbolical school has been drawn off the field." Well, I cannot think that his arguments are sound, but I am equally certain that the Symbolical school is inadequate and inaccurate. It is surprising to see Dr. Andrews favouring a view which is virtually identical with the *opus operatum* theory rejected by the Reformers of the sixteenth century as essentially mediaeval. And it is still more astonishing to think that this very mechanical view should be attributed to St. Paul. I wish Dr. Andrews would read *The Doctrine of the Sacraments* by Dimock for the true view of this ordinance, in which he shows us how to avoid both the mediaeval and the symbolical interpretations.

23. The attitude to St. Paul assumed by Dr. Andrews is truly remarkable, for while on the one hand he is convinced of the sacramentarian exegesis of the Epistles, on the other he is not prepared to " go the length " to which Paulinism (as thus interpreted) seems to carry us. Would it not be better if another attempt were made by Dr. Andrews to see if he has after all arrived at the proper exegesis of the great Apostle ? I quite admit that if this view is correct " it will be very difficult to come to terms with it, since it seems to traverse the fundamental principles and convictions . . . which seem to be the very truth of God." Indeed, it contradicts St. Paul's own teaching about salvation by faith.

The fact is that Luther's consubstantiation is an utterly impossible position. We must either accept the Roman view at once or else maintain the interpretation of the Eucharist associated with Calvin, which assuredly is truer to St. Paul than anything else.

24. Dr. Andrews makes much of what he regards as abundant evidence that sacramental ideas in St. Paul are analogous to those found in the Greek Mysteries. I wonder whether he has given due weight to the recent books of Kennedy and Clemen on this subject. Why should not the Apostle use current terminology without in any way teaching similar, still less identical ideas ?

25. The trouble with Dr. Andrews' article, in my judgment, is that nowhere does he attempt to explain or face the meaning of baptism in the New Testament. Most writers on this subject seem to me to fail here, for if only they would ask themselves the question, What does baptism mean ? they would probably go far to obtain a true interpretation of the various passages.

26. Dr. Andrews closes by saying that the question of the sacraments will only be settled in the higher regions of theology. He maintains that St. Paul's theology involves certain very definite sacramental positions and that "analogies to these positions are to be found in the current religious circles of the time." But I would venture to urge that the data emphasised by Dr. Andrews are inaccurate, and, therefore, that his conclusions are hasty and wrong. His whole article is a surprising illustration of the facility with which scholars are apparently ready to accept German theological conclusions. For my part I have great hope that the present War may lead younger British scholars to show a great deal of hesitation and independence in view of the remarkable ways in which German thought has been proved to be astray on the simplest and most

obvious national and historical facts. If they have been erroneous in these earthly things, is it altogether surprising that we should question their capacity to interpret the spiritual realities of the Apostle Paul ?

Meanwhile, it is impossible for some of us to avoid agreeing with the *Record* of November 9 last that Professor Andrews, " writing as a Free Churchman, illustrates very significantly the change that is coming over the Nonconformist mind. He adopts all the ordinary High Church interpretations of St. Paul's allusions to baptism and the Lord's Supper."

W. H. Griffith Thomas.

THE WOMAN WITH A SPIRIT OF INFIRMITY.

The miracles of our Lord are grouped by the Evangelists in three classes, the miracles on Nature, the miracles on man's body, and the miracles on the spirit-world. There is, of course, a close relation between the second and the third of these classes ; modern critics commonly recognise no distinction between them ; but the dividing line is, in general, clearly marked in the gospel narratives even in such a case as that of the epileptic boy, where physical disease and demon-possession were combined in the same sufferer.

There is, however, one miracle which is not easily classified,—the healing of the woman who had " a spirit of infirmity." Are we to place this incident in the second class of miracles, or in the third ? Was the woman actually " possessed of a devil," or was she merely suffering from a physical complaint ? Bishop Westcott, in his illuminating book on the *Characteristics of the Gospel Miracles,* ranks the case as one of healing, but indicates the doubtfulness of the

classification—or perhaps the abnormal character of the incident—by the use of brackets. Dr. Plummer, in the *International Critical Commentary*, discusses the matter in detail and seems to regard the case as one of demon-possession causing physical infirmity.

I think that a close study of the incident supports Bishop Westcott's classification, and at the same time justifies the use of brackets as indicating that the complaint was not physical disease pure and simple, but had an important feature in common with cases of possession.

The one serious argument for taking it as a case of actual possession is the use of the phrase ἔχων πνεῦμα ἀσθενείας. How much ought we to infer from these words ? The mere mention of diabolic agency of course proves nothing. We have abundant evidence in the New Testament (v. esp. 1 Cor. v. 5 ; 2 Cor. xii. 7 ; and 1 Tim. i. 20) that such agency in the production of physical disease was recognised as something distinct from possession, however frequently the two might be found in combination. We scarcely need St. Paul's assertion of his own sanity in Acts xxvi. 25 to teach us that he did not regard himself as being a demoniac because in the matter of physical disease he was exposed to the assaults of Satan. It is in fact misleading to speak of demon-possession and exorcism except in cases where the *personality* was under the domination of an evil spirit. No one, I think, who has read Bishop Westcott's penetrating analysis of the different types of miracle can fail to realize that the exorcisms were regarded by the Evangelists and by our Lord Himself as having a peculiar moral and spiritual character which they could scarcely have possessed had they not borne a closer relation than the other miracles to the sufferer's personality.

Now in all the admitted cases of exorcism there is some hint given to us of such a state of things. Either the word

"possession" is used—a word which, as I have tried to show, does not naturally bear a lesser meaning—or the demon is expressly said to have been cast out, or the description given to us of the sufferer provides a sufficient indication of the state of his mind. But in the case now under discussion, the hypothesis of mental derangement not only receives no actual support from the details of the narrative, but is even difficult to reconcile with them. The phrase ἔχων πνεῦμα ἀσθενείας seems to be stronger than that which St. Paul uses of his "thorn in the flesh," but not stronger than that which he uses of Hymenæus and Alexander. It seems to point to the conclusion that the woman whom our Lord healed was the victim of Satan in a more definite sense than that in which the phrase could be used of St. Paul, while, on the other hand, it gives us no positive ground for classing her as a demoniac. Nor, I may add, does it compel us to put her case entirely on a level with that of Hymenæus and Alexander, and to suppose with Weiss (quoted by Plummer) that her malady was the result of a sinful life.

There is then no weighty evidence that the woman was actually possessed of a devil. I shall now endeavour to show that the narrative strongly suggests the contrary.

I would remark, however, at the outset that Dr. Plummer appears to be right (as against Weiss) in refusing to allow any inference to be drawn from the use of the word θεραπεύεσθε in v. 14. His references show that St. Luke's use of both θεραπεύειν and ἰᾶσθαι is too general to furnish any basis for distinguishing between a healing and an exorcism. The points which seem to be significant, and perhaps, when taken together, conclusive, are the following:

1. There is an entire absence, as we have already seen, of phraseology implying the domination of the woman's *personality* by an evil spirit.

2. Jesus does not, as seems to have been His usual custom (*v.* Mark i. 27), issue a command to the evil spirit.

3. On the other hand, He does address the sufferer as an intelligent personality. There is nothing parallel to this in the admitted cases of exorcism recorded in the Gospels.[1]

4. The ruler of the synagogue evidently regarded the woman as a responsible agent. The words "come and be healed" are no doubt in the plural, but they must have been addressed partly, if not mainly, to her.

5. The evil spirit, if such there were, utters no cry of recognition of the Son of God. There are, indeed, three cases recorded in which no such open recognition is indicated, but in all these we are expressly told that the spirit was dumb.[2]

6. "Thou art loosed from thine infirmity" does not seem a natural phrase to use in performing an exorcism.

7. There is reason to believe that Jesus never laid His hands on a demoniac. Dr. Plummer urges that "we know too little to affirm" this. But all the evidence that we have supports the statement. Dr. Plummer admits that Jesus "commonly healed demoniacs with a word." But Matthew viii. 16 and Luke iv. 40, 41, especially when taken in combination with the fact that in none of the recorded cases of exorcism did Jesus touch the sufferer, seem to take us somewhat further than this. They at least suggest that there was a reason why demoniacs should not be touched, and create a strong presumption that a case in

[1] I do not think the question in Mark v. 9 is a real parallel.

[2] Matt. ix. 32, and xii. 22, and Mark ix. 17 (and par.[3]). In Mark ix. the spirit is said to have uttered a cry and thrown the boy on the ground. Nothing similar is recorded in the other two cases (cf. Luke xi. 14), but here the Evangelists seem to have had scanty information. It has not, so far as I am aware, been noticed that in neither case are we told the age or sex of the sufferer. Luke's language, in particular, seems to be studiously vague.

which the sufferer *was* touched was not a case of demon-possession.

Nor does Dr. Plummer's attempt to turn the flank of this difficulty seem to be successful. He suggests that the incident is parallel to that in Mark ix., where our Lord, *after* casting out the devil, took the boy by the hand "in order to complete the physical cure," supporting this view by the contention that "ἀπολέλυσαι, which implies that she has already been freed from the πνεῦμα ἀσθενείας, precedes the laying on of hands." But Jesus says nothing at this stage about the spirit; He tells her that she has been loosed from her *infirmity*, that is, surely (at least by inclusion) from her physical complaint. We are not, I think, compelled on grammatical grounds to regard the laying on of hands as subsequent to the deliverance denoted by ἀπολέλυσαι; the perfect may only denote the completeness of the cure, and certainly does not naturally suggest Dr. Plummer's idea that the cure was *in*complete until Jesus had laid His hands upon the sufferer. It is perhaps not out of place to note also that ἀνωρθώθη is not middle, but passive. This seems difficult to reconcile with Godet's view that the first act of healing was psychical, the second physical. And even if we do admit two healing acts, and call the first psychical, that is by no means the same as calling it an exorcism.

It is strange, moreover, if this was really a case of possession, that we have no record or hint, as in the other cases, of the word by which the Lord cast the demon out, but only His statement that the deliverance had been effected.[1]

8. There remains yet another point, which, though not in itself conclusive, seems to me deserving of attention. The casting out of a devil was recognised, even by our Lord's enemies, as a moral and spiritual deliverance of the pos-

[1] The cure of the Syro-Phoenician woman's daughter was performed at a distance, and is therefore not a parallel case.

sessed. It was the fact of this recognition which constituted the awful guilt of those who accused the great Exorcist of complicity with Beelzebub. Neither the fact nor the nature of the cure could be denied ; their frantic hostility had only one resource left—to impugn the motive. It seems therefore to be at least improbable that the ruler of the synagogue should have regarded, or even pretended to regard, the casting out of a devil as a violation of the fourth commandment.

And this contention is supported by a study of the other miracles which our Lord performed in public on the Sabbath Day.[1] All of these, *except the exorcism in the synagogue of Capernaum*, aroused hostile criticism. It is true that in the case of the two Sabbath miracles recorded by St. John, the healing of the impotent man at Bethesda, and the restoration of sight to the man born blind, the criticism was ostensibly directed against such outward acts as carrying a bed, and making clay, but these were doubtless mere pretexts and not the real cause of the hostility. No such outward act was performed in the healing of the man with a withered hand, yet the same hostility was evoked in the minds of the Pharisees who witnessed it. All the more significant is the absence of any such criticism when Jesus healed the demoniac in the same synagogue on the Sabbath Day.

I have presented, in the foregoing pages, the most tangible points which seem to me to differentiate this miracle from our Lord's exorcisms and to connect it with His other miracles of physical healing. But I am conscious that such a presentation does not do full justice to the argument. The differences between the three types of miracle are set forth, far better than I can hope to do it, in the work of Bishop West-

[1] The healing of Simon's wife's mother was of course done in private, and does not therefore concern my present purpose.

cott, to which I have already alluded. Readers of that book will not fail to perceive that the three types are sharply differentiated in the Gospel narratives, and will, I venture to think, be predisposed to accept my contention that the healing of the woman with a "spirit of infirmity" belongs not to the exorcisms, but to the miracles of physical healing.

W. R. Whately.

LITERARY ILLUSTRATIONS OF THE SONG OF SOLOMON.

i. 1. *The Song of songs, which is Solomon's.*

"The part of the Bible chosen by the Jewish synagogue to commemorate the deliverance from Egypt is the Song of Solomon. The language of ecstatic earthly passion seemed to the genius of Israel, the only fitting expression for the emotions with which the chosen people looked back on their deliverance from foreign tyranny; the giving of the Law was, to the nationl consciousness, the marriage-day of Israel."—Julia Wedgwood, *The Message of Israel*, p. 46.

"The parted skies are track'd with flames above,
As Love descends to meet ascending love;
The seasons flourish where the spouses meet,
And earth in gardens spreads beneath their feet;
This fresh-bloom prospect in the bosom throngs,
When Solomon begins his Song of songs,
Bids the rapt soul to Lebanon repair,
And lays the scene of all his actions there,
Where as he wrote, and from the bow'r surveyed
The scenting groves, or answering knots he made,
His sacred art the sights of nature brings
Beyond their use to figure heavenly things."

—Thomas Parnell.

"The relation of sex," says Miss Wedgwood (*The Moral Ideal*, ch. vi.) of Philo, the Jewish philosopher, "lies very near all his views of the relation of God and man. The distinction of the passive and the active, suggested by the two halves of humanity, is ideally complete in the relation of humanity to that which lies above it. Israel was the spouse of the Lord; the ideal Humanity needed the divine for its counterpart, as a bride her bridegroom. . . . Modern scholarship indeed looks with scorn on the view which sees a hidden allegory in the little love-poem included in the Hebrew Scriptures; but this mystic interpretation is no more than a refraction, through the mists of an exclusive worship, of that deep sense of the infinite in human passion, which, though it be constantly the rival of all sense of the Divine, is yet intimately akin to a sense of the antithesis of the Divine and human. The Song of Solomon may bear witness to its intelligent readers far more distinctly than to those who put an unreal meaning into every word, that the feeling which prostrates man before God has a deep and hidden connection with that in which man and woman find, each in each, the completion and explanation of their being. The tenderest love known to humán beings takes a fresh dimension when it is felt as an illustration and type of the Faith in that which engulfs and overshadows them—beyond, beneath, above, in every way transcending human vision and explaining it."

St. Bernard (*Sermones in Cant.* i. 11) writes: "There is a song which by its special dignity and sweetness surpasses all others, and this I may rightly call 'The Song of Songs,' for it is itself the fruit of all the rest. It is never heard outwardly, for it echoes not in public; she only hears it who sings it, and he to whom it is sung, the bride and the bridegroom."

i. 4. *Draw me, we will run after thee.*

"There is no illusion in following God's leading," Fénelon writes to a French lady, "or in abiding in His presence engrossed in love and admiration, provided that such an absorption never gives us the foolish notion that we are very advanced; provided it does not prevent us from being conscious of frailty, imperfection, and the need of improvement; provided it never leads us to neglect any duty. . . . So long as you think of God, love Him, abide in His presence, and cleave to His will without presumption, without neglecting any duty or relaxing in any precept or counsel, without wandering from obedience and the ordinary path, you will be in no danger of delusion. Follow God's leading. Say to the Bridegroom, "Draw me, and I will run after Thee! Put no limit to your recollection of Him, except what is needful for preserving health and fulfilling the duties of your position in life."

i. 5. *I am black, but comely.*

"So dark a colour is not well seen by the Arabs, who in these uplands are less darkish-brown than ruddy. They think it resembles the ignoble blood of slave-races; and therefore even crisp and ringed hair is a deformity, in their eyes. We may remember in the Canticles the paramour excuses the swarthiness of her beautiful locks . . . she magnifies the ruddy whiteness of her beloved."—C. M. Doughty, *Arabia Deserta*, i. 102.

i. 6. *Mine own vineyard have I not kept.*

"A man has no more right to allow his powers to be less useful and profitable than they might be made, than he has to misuse or neglect them altogether."—W. Rathbone Greg, *Literary and Social Judgments*, p. 166.

i. 15. *Behold, thou art fair, my love ; behold thou art fair ; thou hast doves' eyes.*

"The most direct appeals, the most penetrating reminiscences, come to the worshipper of Beauty from a woman's eyes. The steady rise in the status of women ; that constant deepening and complication of the commerce between the sexes which is one of the signs of progressive civilisation ; all this is perpetually teaching and preaching (if I may say so) the charm of womanhood to all sections of the community. . . . All the arts, in fact, are returning now to the spirit of Leonardo, to the sense that of all visible objects known to us the human face and form are the most complex and mysterious, to the desire to extract the utmost secret, the occult message, from all the phenomena of Life and Being." —F. W. H. Myers, *Modern Essays*, pp. 319–320.

ii. 2. *As the lily among thorns,*
So is my love.

"If we regard the virtue of loving purity and pure love as a lily which we ourselves should covet and apprehend, let us be sure that it can be reached only by those who will struggle forward to it through the thorns of difficulty, perplexity, and painful mortification ; who grasp it with bleeding hands. And those who would preserve it when grasped, must hedge themselves round with thorns, with safeguards and precautions, with the thousand little weapons which, weak in themselves but strong in their multitude, keep the world, the flesh, and the devil, at a safe distance."— Father Tyrrell, *Nova et Vetera*, pp. 32–33.

ii. 9. *My beloved . . . looketh forth at the windows, showing himself at the lattice.*

"Though we are beloved by Thy Son, it doth not yet appear what we shall be. He looks through the lattices of the flesh, He has charmed us and set us afire, and we run after

His fragrance. But when He appears, we shall be like Him, for we shall see Him as He is; ours then, as not yet, O Lord, to see in full reality."—AUGUSTINE, *Confessions*, xiii. 15.

ii. 8. *The voice of my beloved.*

"The Christ that saveth you is a speaking Christ; the Church knoweth Him by His voice, and can discern His tongue amongst a thousand. . . . When our Lord cometh, He speaketh to the heart in the simplicity of His gospel."—SAMUEL RUTHERFORD, *Letters* (vii.).

ii. 10–12. *Rise up, my love, my fair one, and come away,*
For lo, the winter is past,
The rain is over and gone;
The flowers appear on the earth;
The time of the singing of birds is come.

"It was not in the winter
Our loving lot was cast;
It was the time of roses,
We plucked them as we passed.

That churlish season never frowned
On early lovers yet!
Oh no!—the world was newly crowned
With flowers when first we met."

—HOOD.

Ruskin quoted from this passage in one of his last lectures at Oxford on "Birds and How to Paint them": "Don't go to London or to any other town in the spring—don't let the morning winds of May find your cheeks pale and your eyes bloodshot with sitting up all night, nor the violets bloom for you only in the salesman's bundles, nor the birds sing around, if not above, the graves you have dug for yourselves before your time. Time enough you will have hereafter to be deaf to their song, and ages enough to be blind to their

brightness, if you seek not the sight given now. If there be any human love in your youth, if any sacred hope, if any faithful religion, let them not be defiled and quenched among the iniquities of the multitude. Your Love is in the clefts of the Rock, when the flowers appear on the earth, and the time of the singing of birds is come, and the God of all Love calls you 'from the top of Amana, from the top of Shenir and Hermon,' calls to every pure spirit among the children of men, as they to those they love best—'Arise, my love, my fair one, and come away.'"

The voice of the turtle is heard in the land.

Jerome, in his treatise against Jovinianus (i. 29), quotes this as a proof for celibacy and against second marriage. "The turtle, the chastest of birds, which always stays in high places, is a type of the Saviour. If we read the works of naturalists, we find that when the turtle dove loses its mate, its habit is never to take another; hence we understand that even the dumb birds repudiate second marriage."

"Is life worth living? Yes, so long
As Spring revives the year,
And hails us with the cuckoo's song,
To show that she is here;
While over orchard daffodils
Cloud-shadows float and fleet,
And onzel pipes and laverock trills,
And young lambs buck and bleat;
So long as that which bursts the bud
And swells and tunes the rill,
Makes springtime in a maiden's blood,
Life is worth living still."

—Alfred Austin.

Eugénie de Guérin writes in her journal (April 20, 1840): "Oh, it was really a nightingale that I heard this

morning. I note two things every year—the arrival of the nightingale and of the first flower. These are epochs in the country and in my life. When I hear the nightingale or see a swallow, I say to myself, 'The winter is over,' with inexpressible pleasure. For me it is a new birth out of cold, fog, a dull sky, out of a whole dead nature. Thought reappears with all its flowers."

St. Bernard, in his book on *Love to God* (8), allegorises this passage: "The signs of the Resurrection? consider the new flowers of the following season, flowering afresh under grace into a new summer; their fruit shall be brought forth by the general resurrection to come, at the end, and to remain without end. *Now* he saith, *the winter is past, the rain is over and gone, the flowers have appeared on the earth*—meaning that the summer time has arrived with Him who was released from death's chill into a warmer spring of new life. *Behold,* He saith, *I make all things new*—He whose flesh was sown in death and flowered anew in the resurrection, He at whose fragrance dry things at once turn green in the valley of our life, cold things grow warm, dead things revive."

ii. 17. *Until the day break, and the shadows flee away.*

"Man has walked by the light of conflagrations, and amid the sound of falling cities; and now there is darkness and long watching till it be morning."—CARLYLE, *Characteristics* (Essay on).

ii. 17. *Turn, my beloved, and be thou like a roe or a young hart on the mountains of Bether* (*R.V.* margin, *on the mountains of separation*).

"Of a' the airts the wind can blaw,
I dearly like the west,
For there the bonny lassie lives,
The lassie I lo'e best:

There wild woods grow, and rivers flow,
And mony a hill between."

—Burns.

iii. 1–2. *By night on my bed I sought him whom my soul loveth ;*
I sought him, but I found him not.
I will rise now and go about the city in the streets,
And in the broad ways I will seek him whom my soul loveth :
I sought him, but I found him not.

"What, on the whole, is the religion of England? It is restlessness. Look round, I say, and answer, why it is that there is so much swift change, so much strife, so many parties and sects, so many creeds? Because men are unsatisfied and restless ; and why restless, with every one his psalm, his doctrine, his tongue, his revelation, his interpretation? They are restless because they have not found. Alas! so it is, in this country called Christian ; vast numbers have gained little from religion, beyond a thirst after what they have not, a thirst for this true peace, and the fever and restlessness of thirst. It has not yet brought them into the presence of Christ. . . . Having no such apprehension of things unseen, they have still to seek, and are at the mercy of every rumour from without, which purports to bring tidings of Him and of the place of His abode. 'By night on my bed I sought Him whom my soul loveth, I sought Him but I found Him not.'"—Newman, *Sermons on Subjects of the Day* (xxi.).

"When the singer of the Song of Songs seems to borrow the phrase of human love, it is rather that human love had first borrowed the truths of the love of God."—Alice Meynell, *The Rhythm of Life*, p. 92.

iii. 7–8. *Behold his bed, which is Solomon's;*
Threescore valiant men are about it,
Of the valiant of Israel.
They all hold swords, being expert in war;
Every man hath his sword upon his thigh,
Because of fear in the night.

"I know
'Tis not the balm, the sceptre, and the ball,
The sword, the mace, the crown imperial,
The intertissued robe of gold and pearl,
The farced title running 'fore the king,
The throne he sits on, nor the tide of pomp
That beats upon the high shore of this world,
No, not all these, thrice-gorgeous ceremony,
Not all these, laid in bed majestical,
Can sleep so soundly as the wretched slave,
Who with a body filled and vacant mind
Gets him to rest, cramm'd with distressful bread."
—SHAKESPEARE, *King Henry V.* (Act iv., scene 1).

iv. 7. *Thou art all fair, my love; there is no spot in thee.*

"It should be part of our private ritual to devote a quarter of an hour every day to the enumeration of the good qualities of our friends. When we are not *active*, we fall back idly on defects, even of those whom we love."—MARK RUTHERFORD, *Last Pages of a Journal*, p. 319.

iv. 12. *My spouse is . . . a spring sealed up, a fountain sealed.*

"The soul . . . can love irregularly; and no irregular love is the love of God. It can forbear to love while God loveth. It can love while God forbeareth. It can love a wicked man, wickedly, and in his wickedness. This shows plainly that it can love regularly, with a love that is not

merely a reflection of God's. For which cause it is not called a mirror, but esteemed more, a real fountain : *my love is a spring shut up, a fountain sealed.* That is, shut up like a letter, and concealed yet ; but in the Kingdom of Heaven her contents and secrets shall be known, and her beauty read of all men."—THOMAS TRAHERNE, *Centuries of Meditations*, p. 304.

iv. 12. *A garden enclosed is my sister, my spouse.*

"She thought she had ceased to love Denis—but what had she loved in him but her happiness and his ? Their affection had been the *garden enclosed* of Canticles, where they were to walk forever in a delicate isolation of bliss. But now love appeared to her as something more than this —something wider, deeper, more enduring than the selfish passion of a man and a woman. She saw it in all its far-reaching issues, till the first meeting of two pairs of young eyes kindled a light which might be a high-lifted beacon across dark waters of humanity."—EDITH WHARTON, in *Sanctuary*.

iv. 16. *Awake, O north wind ; and come, thou south,*
Blow upon my garden, that the spices thereof may flow out.

"O gentle wind that bloweth south,
From where my love repaireth,
Convey a kiss from his dear mouth,
And tell me how he faireth ! "

From the Scots ballad, *The Dowie Dens o' Yarrow.*

JAMES MOFFATT.

THE COMMUNIST SIGNIFICANCE OF THE LOGIA.

(1) Up to the present we have been trying, as it were, to catch the notes of the earliest Christian utterances as they fell upon the air, without any presuppositions except those which are involved in all language. We began by tracing the distinction between the spoken and the written word in the synoptic Gospels.[1] Our inquiry helped us to see, perhaps a little better, the urbane man of the world—along with more mysterious endowments—even in Jesus Himself.[2] We then went on to listen to the eager utterances of St. Paul from those lower levels of the Roman empire, to which at first the new movement was mainly restricted.[3] Even in the Fourth Gospel we could inform ourselves of the turns of speech which belong to the earliest times.[4] Only now can we turn with a little more confidence to the question: what precisely was that element—along with the personality of Jesus Himself—that gave the touch of "home," and "homeliness" to the first Christian utterances? Perhaps, if we can answer this question, we can face the other and connected question: Why is it that the working man has so often found himself precisely not at home in the visible Christian community? Our question suggests its own answer. "Home" and "homeliness" mean in part friendly companionship, but also the kindly supply of immediate physical needs.

It is no question about the mere language spoken by

[1] Expositor, April, 1915. [2] Ibid., June, 1915.
[3] Ibid., Oct., 1915. [4] Ibid., May, 1916.

Jesus upon which we are now about to engage. For the moment we must even forget the word 'gospel.' Just a glance at a concordance will guide us to the conclusion to which our previous studies have been pointing. We must lay aside the term 'gospel' for historical reasons as the general name for the contents of the four documents which bring to us the words and deeds of Jesus. For neither the Third nor the Fourth Gospels contain the term 'gospel' (εὐαγγέλιον). If we may judge from the Septuagint, εὐαγγέλιον followed for the Greek-speaking Jew upon the verb εὐαγγελίζομαι. For Luke "narrative," διήγησις, describes the form of the compositions which he had before him. And λόγος stands for that of which the earliest followers of Jesus were the eyewitnesses and servants. We are thus prepared for the use of the term λόγος in the Fourth Gospel [1] to describe its subject matter. And here we may remind ourselves once more of the ambiguity underlying the Semitic notion of 'the word,' by which it stands not only as a sign, but as equivalent to the significate (Luke i. 37).

Hence we may regard λόγος as taking precedence of εὐαγγέλιον to denote not only the manner—the spoken word—but the matter of Christian teaching. The Word of the Fourth Gospel, therefore, may be identified with the Discourse on the Mountain. The teacher is identified with his message.

(2) While the personality of Jesus was still most vividly impressed upon His followers, the collections of His sayings would be enough for the purpose of the usual instructions. Only as His figure became more dim through the death of those who had been witnesses of 'the word' was it necessary to fill their place by 'narratives' which described His life and acts. Hence we must put on one side the

[1] Expositor, May, 1916, p. 369.

biography if we wish to imagine the subject matter of the earliest Christian teaching. The authority of the teacher was taken for granted in His presence: the biography came later, not to justify, but to explain that authority.

The attempt to reconstruct the common source or sources of Matthew and Luke will now take for us another turn. Not the material of the common source, so much as its form —its character of oral teaching—will dominate us as we try to draw nearer to this gorgeous dawn of the gospel. At any rate, to come down to detail, one obvious cause of the variations in these attempts is due to the fact that Matthew and Luke had before them several collections of the sayings of the Lord. Of these collections one seems to have claimed to be the substance of the teaching of Jesus: a collection which appears in Luke [1]—contrary to his practice—in so formless a shape compared with the Sermon on the Mount in Matthew, that we are tempted to think that the Discourse on the Plain was regarded with special authority, and therefore it was not subjected by Luke to the revision which we have traced in his treatment of his other material. A single illustration shall suffice: he allows the vernacular *αἴρω* for stealing a garment against the more formal *λαμβάνειν* of Matthew.[2]

(3) The biography of Jesus, then, is important because it declares the authority of the teacher. Or rather the life of Jesus was identified with His teaching. The Word became flesh. That is why the Gospel is more important than the Epistle, than the commentary of St. Paul. To dwell upon the authority of Jesus to the exclusion of His teaching, is to exalt the imagination which we form in our own minds, above the imagination which He, through His word, would create in the same recalcitrant material. The reason, therefore, why so many persons lay a dispro-

[1] vi. 20–49. [2] v. 40.

portionate emphasis upon the authority of Jesus, is because they are dealing with a difficulty which only arose, so to speak, in the second degree, that is, when the first giving of the precepts had already retreated into the historic past. In those earliest days, as throughout the history of the Church, more persons have been ready to say the creed than to practise the evangelical precepts; to "believe in" rather than to "believe." But the inability—I do not say the unwillingness—to believe these precepts has been partly caused by their removal from their context, by their apparent inapplicability to the immediate circumstances of human life. But among the many revolutions which the present war is producing, not the least is the transformation of our idea of the state as such, that is, of the environment within which the words of the Lord are to hold good. Laws and regulations which, because of their "communist" character, before the war would in many quarters have met with the fiercest opposition as tending to the break up of settled society, are now accepted by the old opponents of "socialism" or "communism" as part of their ordinary daily life. Under the stress of war, we are actually approaching just that point of view which seemed, not so long since, far removed from practice, and yet is now turning out to be the most practical of all. We are approaching by long strides just that mode of life of which the outlines are sketched in Luke vi. 20–49. What if this inmost kernel of the evangelical tradition turned out precisely to be a medicine for our present inmost need!

(4) Hence this Discourse on the Plain requires, for its commentary, some further understanding of the group of human beings to which it was addressed. To separate the discourse from the audience has been to mutilate the message. If this principle is admitted, two consequences follow. On the one hand, there is the economic side—

the material conditions—of social life as it was then, and as it is being repeated now. And there will be the corresponding application of the sayings of Jesus, now as then, to daily needs in a literal sense. On the other hand, there will be, not less, the spiritual side of social life, which is only possible for the ordinary person when certain material conditions have been satisfied. Corresponding also to this higher side, there will be those elements in the teaching of Jesus, which deal with the obligation of the individual to enter upon the spiritual life. In the third place, and as a complement of this relation of the spiritual to the material, there is the striking fact which the gospel, more triumphantly than any other philosophy, shows: that it is possible for the individual to lead a spiritual life almost in defiance of material needs. In the interpretation of the Discourse, therefore, we must take account of these three grades of economic reference. At the lowest stage, the spiritual view of the excessively poor is clouded by their pressing needs. It is probable, indeed, that throughout the ages human misery has extended far beyond that "submerged tenth" which has measured for us the obvious failure of social arrangements. In other words, the present pall of misery which is spreading over the world is only an innovation to the happier part—recently indeed the larger part—of mankind. In the second place, the spiritual middle class has had just enough comfort to prevent it from realising the unhappiness of the rest of the world. It is really left, therefore, in the third place, for those who have completely overcome the world (in the only way possible, by foregoing its ambitions) to carry on the mobilisation of the spiritual forces in the world.

(5) With these explanations we can now go on to trace the economic or material side of the primitive Christian society, in order thereby to exhibit more clearly the setting

of the spiritual life. Jesus and His followers and adherents (the meaning of this distinction will appear later) formed a society of which, we must not forget, contemporary Judaism furnished many parallels. The common life of the first Christian society was expressed, however, in a peculiarly attractive way by the assemblies which gathered round Jesus as the gracious host. For He was this even more than the teacher. Not only, therefore, was there the gathering for the purposes of instruction, either on the hills and plains of the country side or in the Temple at Jerusalem and on the opposing slopes of Olivet; there was also the common meal and (for we must admit the fact) the common fund. In the feeding of the thousands, the miracle probably consisted in the joint contributions to the common stock. A still more striking miracle was the fact that the host at these delightful picnics not only set His face sternly against the waste of bread, but actually induced this gathering of poor people to collect the fragments. The community which was created from time to time by the hospitable presence of the Master transformed the bread which it shared into the material of a banquet, and made waste of bread into something sacrilegious. It was this intimate and interchanged regard of its members that marked off this society from other similar groups. Their joyousness was that of a marriage feast. And this intimacy was deepened for some by their entire dependence upon the common fund. Jesus was not the only one who had no possessions apart from the purse which was kept by the treasurer of the brotherhood. The instruction, therefore, to the young ruler "to sell his property and give to the poor" was a familiar accompaniment of entrance into the brotherhood, that is, for one who was invited to the highest degree. The young ruler was merely invited to make the same sacrifice as that which had already been

made by Peter and others. A misunderstanding of the economic conditions of this early society probably explains why the following of Jesus, after leaving monetary possessions, was spoken of by a later commentator as "a cross" (Mark x. 21). Doubtless it was the use of the gospel for catechetical purposes that explains the intrusion of such notes from the margin to the text. Another such case is the phrase "those who trust in riches" (Mark x. 24). Both these glosses are apparently of somewhat late date, and came from scribes to whom the primitive community of goods was difficult to understand.

In a word, the brotherhood of Jesus not only rested partly on communism but was largely moved by its spirit. And although the wealth of individuals was not irreconcilable with such a movement, the possession of wealth was certainly regarded within the community as an almost insuperable hindrance to the most intimate companionship.

Short of this, there were apparently numerous adherents who contributed freely to passing needs. Such were the persons who furnished the ass on which Jesus rode into Jerusalem, and again supplied the room for the last supper. This distinction between the "follower" or "companion" and the rest of the community reflected similar distinctions among the Pharisees, or, to quote a later example, among the Mohammedans among whom the "companions" of the prophet were specially regarded. Jesus therefore took over the characteristic Semitic institution of the brotherhood, gave it a more spiritual turn, and made it the basis of the new community.

(6) We are thus in the presence of what, at first sight, seemed to its contemporaries a religious movement within the limits of the Jewish religion. In the severity of the claims which it made upon some of its members, it resembled Pharisaism, in which also there were degrees of membership.

In its attitude to the national religion, it resembled the Zadokite movement of which Dr. Charles has given so comprehensive a discussion.[1] In Acts the Pharisees, the Sadducees and the Christians are alike spoken of as "sects."[2] But, as Dr. Charles points out, it is a misuse of the term "sect" to apply it to the Pharisees, as though they were thought to be in any way separated from the national religion. And the same consideration applies equally to the Christians and to the Zadokites. As with the Zadokite movement, so the earlier passages in the history of the Christian society, were more in harmony with the spirit of Judaism generally than appeared in the light of later events. "Matthew's" gospel carries numerous traces of this point of view. The influence, also, of James, the brother of the Lord, whom a trustworthy tradition represents as frequenting the temple throughout his life, can only be understood in the light of some such assumption. And, as a matter of fact, the breach between Judaism and the primitive Church did not take place until late.

(7) It is too much overlooked that even the crucifixion did not bring about a breach between Judaism and the primitive Church.[3] The reason for this is perhaps becoming clear. So long as Jesus could be regarded simply as a prophet, so long, that is, as He produced no changes in the world of finance and economics, He seems to have been left alone. But when He challenged the monetary interests of the wealthier classes, the case was altered. It was obviously intolerable that the branch banks in the precincts of the temple—not to speak of the cattle dealers and the contractors for the supply of victims—should have their business interfered with by a purely religious move-

[1] *Fragments of a Zadokite Work*, vii. [2] xv. 5, v. 17, xxiv. 5.

[3] This is rightly recognised by Jewish critics. Max Radin, *The Jews among the Greeks and Romans*, 316.

ment. Obviously, the spread of a heterodox political economy on the lines which we have been tracing, threatened the interests of the Roman and Jewish officials. The attempt had already been made by the latter to embroil Jesus with the Roman authorities over the tribute money and that had failed. The situation then received more serious handling. One of the inner circle was bribed to conspire with the religious authorities to tinge the new leader with blasphemy, and, by playing on the susceptibility of the Roman official to charges of disloyalty, the religious leader was brought to execution ostensibly—and the crowd believed it—as a religious and political innovator, really because His presence in Jerusalem was inconvenient to the higher finance. Mammon, then, was the apparently victorious enemy. But only in appearance. For Jesus and the early Church fought and beat Mammon on its own ground. The financial affairs of the early Church seem, on the whole, to have been remarkably well managed both in the lifetime of Jesus and afterwards. He noted with the amused tolerance of an understanding observer the economic basis of His passing popularity.[1] Nor—we may assume—was He entirely taken by surprise when the business temperament of Judas—"the man from town"[2]—succumbed to a financial temptation. Yet over against the traitor Judas we must set Matthew, to whom probably the original form of the First Gospel is due. Jesus Himself, like these two, moved familiarly enough among the notions of the commercial arithmetic of His time. Many of His recorded sayings show that He claimed to transfer to spiritual subjects the notions of profit and loss and even of gambling, which were familiar enough not only in Jerusalem,

[1] John vi. 26 is probably historic.

[2] Have we not in Iscariot a nickname such as Boanerges, Cephas and the rest ?

but still more in the Jewish circles of the great capitals, Rome, Alexandria, Antioch. "Be ye approved money-changers." "What shall it profit a man if he gain the whole world and lose himself?" Precise numerical values, whether in the parable of that lost sheep which was just one per cent. of the flock, the exactness of the parable of the talents, the market price of small birds intended for the table are not confined to the gospel according to the inland revenue collector. They occur in Mark and Luke as well, and may with certainty be attributed to Jesus Himself.

Finance, at least, involves the comparison of values. And actually the spiritual judgment of value renders more acute sometimes the business instinct. Spiritual self-sacrifice, therefore, reaches its highest degree of self-consciousness precisely in those who are most susceptible to the lower modes of valuation. It was, therefore, the hated rival in the business field whom the wealthy sanhedrin executed by a cruel irony between two thieves, as though the gospel were nothing more than a communist movement which threatened private property.

(8) The prominence which we have given to the financial side of the new social order inaugurated by Jesus, corresponds on the one hand to the prominence which an economic fact, the absence of wealth, in a word, poverty, receives: in the earliest record, "the poor have the gospel preached to them." On the other hand, our economic emphasis corresponds positively to the denunciation of Mammon. Under the influence indeed of Mr. Samuel Smiles, we find it difficult to understand that the enmity of Moloch and of Belial is less dangerous to the Christian Church than the friendship of Mammon. To take military service first, there was indeed a lofty ideal proposed in the absolute self-effacement of certain persons before the violence of

others.[1] But that qualification of non-resistance which Jesus demanded from the "perfect" was not after all indispensable for faith even of the truest kind. It was an officer of the imperial army who showed an intensity of belief beyond what was found in Israel itself. And it might almost be said that the one class of men who are well spoken of in the New Testament belonged to the Roman legions, those legions which stretched along the Rhine and the Danube, the Tigris and the Nile, by whom, as sentinels, the Christian community (along with the other constituents of the Roman empire) was in its beginnings protected.

Again, Jesus contemplated the case in which a man might be called upon to leave his wife and children for the sake of the kingdom. Just as the "perfect" might be called to surrender all their possessions and even the right of resisting injury, so they might be called to a celibate life, and to surrender all those ties which culminate in Christian marriage. It is curious that Matthew and Mark speak of a man leaving his children, and that they say nothing about his wife. Luke, nevertheless, in referring to the wife, probably retains the original form of the saying. The objection, therefore, which, from time to time, has been raised in some quarters against military service is only consistent when as, with the Egyptian monks, it has carried with it the surrender of private property, and of all private ties that are based upon the family.

(9) If therefore we take account of the conditions under which the laws of Jesus were to operate, we need not dismiss the Sermon on the Mount and the Discourse on the Plain as inapplicable to modern conditions. We must rather put the question in another way. How far do modern conditions illustrate the success of precisely those

[1] Matt. v. 39.

principles which are formulated in the laws in question ?

It is probably an illusion which represents to us the population of Palestine as engaged in religious discussion. This—we may take it—was confined to a minority, influential indeed. But for the majority, a speaker was bound to deal in the expressions of every-day purposes and needs ; that is to say, his language would be businesslike, practical. And it is precisely this character that, along with the elements of spiritual beauty, characterises many of the sayings of Jesus. Now when the economic conditions passed away, which environed the earliest Church, the application of many of the sayings of Jesus would also become less obvious. Consequently glosses were added, which gave to plain everyday sayings the spiritual colouring which seemed to belong to their permanent significance. In this respect, " Matthew " modifies the original text by mere additions for purposes of edification. Consequently it is reasonable to think that the shorter forms of the sayings which are given by Luke are the earlier. " Blessed are the poor " is perhaps earlier than " blessed are the poor in spirit." " Blessed are ye hungry " would thus be earlier than " blessed are they that hunger and thirst after justice." Human need, whether in its most general form of poverty or in its special form of hunger, did actually find satisfaction in the society of which we have traced the outlines. On the other hand, the actual possession of wealth and the absence of need rendered persons less likely to relish a social order in which the poor stood to gain most.

In these first moments, therefore, provision was made not only for those who hungered and thirsted after justice, but for those who felt the pangs of physical hunger. Then —and not before—came the offer of spiritual satisfactions. And it is at this point that Matthew seems to take up the

themes of Luke. Is it impossible that the Lord's Prayer as given in Matthew contains an allusion to the satisfaction of a spiritual hunger? For just as the bread of Luke satisfied the physical hunger of the company, so, on the other hand, we might imagine the bread of Matthew to have a spiritual meaning. The original phrase in the Aramaic Gospel of Matthew was "daily." But the editor of the Greek gospel seems to have had a further meaning in view with his word ἐπιούσιος. And although we might not accept the rendering of Jerome, "supersubstantial," it would be quite in accordance with the manner of "Matthew" to give a symbolic turn, such as that which we find in the Fourth Gospel, where the commentators exert themselves in finding various interpretations for the phrase "the bread from heaven." [1]

We thus reach, incidentally, a valuable canon of interpretation. When there are two parallel sayings, of which one has immediate reference to human conditions, while the other is supplemented by a spiritual application, it is probable that the shorter form is the earlier.

(10) On a previous occasion [2] it has been shown that the phrase in the prologue to the Fourth Gospel, "the light that lighteth every man that cometh into the world," is to be understood of the law and also of the lawgiver. If, therefore, we wish to understand the sayings of Jesus when we regard Him as the lawgiver, we must mark the immediate colouring which the legislation necessarily takes from the community to which it was addressed. We may therefore rightly expect, along with this reference to the conditions of daily life, a certain definiteness and clearness in the Gospel. And this, of course, we find just because the Gospel has treated the material conditions of the community as the starting point for spiritual develop-

[1] John vi. 31.

[2] Expositor, May, 1916, p. 354.

ment. Whatever meanings, therefore, we attach to the leading terms of the Christian code, these meanings must at least include that of ordinary life.

(11) It is unfortunate, therefore, that the term "justice," with its happy double meaning, should be replaced in the English versions alone by another term, "righteousness." The Latin, the French and the German versions use the same word for the "justice" of earth and the "justice" of heaven. Shakespeare, whose references to the English Bible are so numerous, always says "justice," as in the speech of Portia, and never "righteousness," the latter word not belonging to his vocabulary. We may infer, therefore, that the translators of the Authorised Version, here as elsewhere, sometimes broke away from the vernacular of their own day. The English of the Authorised Version is not merely the language of 1611, but it has taken up into itself the usages of previous translators, and so acquires that artificial character which seems inseparable from the highest human achievement. Yet it is obvious that in order to express the meaning of the practical man, recourse must be strictly limited to the current forms of expression. In this respect the Greek New Testament is more "vulgar" than our great English version.[1] In so far, therefore, as the language of the English versions suggests that the original is not like the language of daily life, there is a risk that the appeal of the original to "the common people" will be misrepresented.

(12) But the opposite fault is the more dangerous. When we insist upon the immediate, the vulgar, application of "the sayings," we are not therefore to remove the element of mystery from the Gospel. The emphasis upon material conditions should only set in higher relief the spiritual point of view. Behind and above the obvious relations

[1] Kenyon, *Our Bible and the Ancient MSS.*, 233.

of life—those historical facts in which, to the first glance, the action of the divine providence seems enshrined—there lie, concealed perhaps, at any rate difficult to discern, facts of another order. The First Gospel is distinguished from the Third by the interest of the editor in just this deeper meaning. His manual for the Christian catechumen emphasises the dependence of the evangelical history upon the prophets of older Judaism and finds there a partial clue to the mysterious series of happenings. Matthew's Gospel thus shows a psychological tendency, an introspection, divining the spirit which values and controls the inmost life. Hence in the field of value we are driven by him from the outward reward or punishment to the secret, the spiritual, the heavenly reward.

If the true life is hidden, at least in great part, then "the Father who seeth [that life], will reward in secret." [1] We are thus introduced to an obscure order of values. A parallel may help us here. The work of money in facilitating the exchange of commodities overshadows, in the method of most political economists, the use of money in distributing reward for work done. It is this latter use of money that furnishes a rough symbol for the allotment of happiness under the secret, the spiritual, the celestial, régime. Matthew alone records the anecdote of the workmen who received the same wage for differing hours of service. "The spirit does not give by measure." [2] But we must dismiss not only the notion of the actual adjustment of the spiritual reward to the material service, we must also reconsider our notion of time as though time was uniformly valuable. Our study of Paul has prepared us for this last step, and it is a big step. For in taking it, we change the meaning of eschatology. Our object, though it is to be attained in time, is itself outside of time. The victor's wreath of

[1] Matt. vi. 6. [2] John iii. 34.

olive comes to him from the unseen just at the moment when he fatally droops in the race. We thus regard the future not as merely continuous with the present, but also as containing a secret which transcends each passing moment. We no longer look merely forward to the establishment of an ultimate kingdom ; the celestial régime—the reader will perhaps pardon for the sake of freshness the alternative phrase—opens out not only *before*, but *within*, the soul. "The mind," says Blake, "is a world opening within." Hence the reading of Marcion in the Lord's Prayer : "Let Thy Holy Spirit come upon us and cleanse us," instead of "Thy kingdom come," if it is indeed merely a gloss and not an alternative form, accords with the other parts of the primitive gospel. Matthew and Luke, then, were conscious of the inner life as the scene of spiritual events. It was left for these events to be dramatised in the Fourth Gospel. And thus we are summoned to dismiss the notion that mere priority is the test of what is fundamental. The earliest in time may be latest in the order of the spirit : a fact which Aristotle so generally expressed in his distinction between what is "prior for us," and what is "prior for Nature." This difference is lifted up into the spiritual sphere in "the sayings" : "many shall be last that are first, and first that are last." A brilliant Italian writer, Signor Ferrabino, in his recent book *Kalypso*,[1] has shown that the classical myths are to be interpreted not from their presumed origin but just at the moment when they exercise their empire most intimately over the human spirit. The same principle may be applied to the "tradition" of the evangelical teaching. The communion of the spirit overleaps the barriers of time and space as well as of money. Jesus, as the gracious host of the Synoptics, is remarkably interpreted in the Fourth Gospel. "If a man

[1] Turin. Fratelli Bocca, 1914.

love me, he will keep my words: and my father will love him, and we will come to him and stop the night." This little picture is carried a stage further in the apocalypse. "Behold, I stand knocking at the door: if a man hears my voice, I will come in and take supper with him and he with me." The story of Emmaus brings together in the most intimate way, and causes to converge upon us, all these elements which take so modern a turn at this moment of writing: "He was known to them in the breaking of bread." We rise into the pure air of beauty upon the wings of these spiritualised commonplaces, Newman's "Lead, Kindly Light" is but a shimmering gleam reflected upon us precisely thence.

(13) Over against the outer world—thus not entirely incapable of being the home of the new society—there opens the inner world which is ours, first of all, as shared with others, and then also as our own. And the name for this subordination and realisation of the individual in the society is "communion," or, to use the language of the present day, "communism," κοινωνία. This communism, we now recognise, is two-fold; spiritual and economical. We have learned on the one hand to estimate the economic conditions of the primitive society as we find it in Luke. On the other hand, there is the profounder meaning upon which "Matthew" loves to dwell. The communism of Jerusalem, then, about which much has been said, was not a mere incident; it was characteristic of the Christian Church. Nor was it the cause of the relative poverty of the Christians in Jerusalem. The Jews of the dispersion, then as now, were wealthier than the Jews of the national capital. Alexandria, Antioch, and especially Rome, the last already in Cicero's time, contributed large sums by way of the ordinary assessment of the half shekel to the temple service. Similar offerings to the temple

were also brought by Paul, along with the special gifts to "the saints," on that final and fateful journey to Jerusalem. Alongside, therefore, of the spiritual mission of Paul—who is still the Jew [1]—we find represented in the most vivid way possible the economic attitude which characterises the specially Pauline gospel of Luke. "For Macedonia and Achaia decided to make a 'communion' with the saints in Jerusalem. For if the nations made a 'communion' in spiritual things, they ought also to perform their 'liturgy' in material things." [2] This liturgy was apparently a constitutional or official act. For it was put on a level with the payment of the temple tax.

We have, therefore, here a formal recognition of the community in both the senses of that term. *Κοινωνία* was used in classical Greek to denote the society of men one with another in political organisations, business partnerships, and elsewhere. It also denoted in Plato the mode in which particular instances—shall we say individuals?—shared in the universal law or form which makes them what they are. Perhaps some echo of this last meaning had lingered round the word when Paul used it for the communion of the spirit. But Paul shares with Philo another use of the word. The whole body with its varied organs enters into a community.[3] It is this medical sense of *κοινωνία* which is suggested when we come to the communion of the body and of the blood.[4] This medical sense of *κοινωνία* receives support from another passage (1 Cor. xi. 27–29). Through partaking of the "communion" in its double sense, the individual is, so to speak, "embodied"

[1] Acts xxiii. 6. [2] Rom. xv. 26–27. [3] Eph. iv. 16.

[4] 1 Cor. x. 16; Philo, *de Opificio Mundi*, c. 47. Cicero, *anima naturaliter Christiana*, anticipates the Christian ideas here involved: "Magna est enim vis humanitatis, multum valet communio sanguinis." *Pro Rosc. Am.* 22, 63.

in the society. Hence, in a rash moment, we might be tempted to suggest that the word "communism" might replace the word "communion" in the benediction, for those who insisted on the spiritual meaning to the exclusion of the other meaning, while the social reformer who calls upon the Church to "communicate" with the poor in material things should be reminded that, when all is said, "the communion of the spirit" is of the essence of the Christian society.

FRANK GRANGER.

THE MINISTRY OF JOHN THE BAPTIST.

It may fairly be said that the Baptist's mission has received, considering its importance, a smaller share of close study than any other section of the Gospels. Yet this is not a matter for surprise, or even, in one sense, for regret. "All men come to Him," complained the Baptist's disciples, jealous for his influence and chagrined to see it wane. Their experience, which fulfilled their master's noblest joy, has been repeated through the centuries. Jesus Christ has drawn all men to Himself. The supreme radiance of His glory has blinded us to the shining of His daystar. The work of John has been neglected to a degree that were impossible had it stood less near in time to that of Christ. His predecessors fare better at our hands. We recognise the importance of each Old Testament prophet; the circumstances of his age, the character of his message, the special contribution made by him to the task of preparing the way of Christ are the frequent theme of books, lectures, and sermons. Less regard is paid to him who was more than a prophet. True, the narratives of his birth and death are abundantly familiar, by reason of their picturesqueness. But, for the rest, the ordinary man, with an average knowledge of his Bible, thinks rather vaguely of John as our Lord's herald and baptizer, and as one whose rigid austerity served best to throw into greater relief the tender compassion of Jesus. Preachers are content, for the most part, to praise the Baptist's courage and unselfishness.[1] Such eulogy is well deserved, yet it was (as the context shows)

[1] As, for instance, in two noble sermons by F. W. Robertson: "The Pharisees and Sadducees at John's baptism" and "John's rebuke of Herod."

to his position and office rather than his moral worth that our Lord referred when declaring that among mankind "there hath not arisen a greater than John the Baptist."

What, then, was the nature of the office gaining this estimate? What was the content of John's message? How far did it differ from those of the earlier prophets? What was the nature of his Messianic hope, and to what degree did the event correspond with it? What were John's relations with Christ? Why did some of his disciples remain alien in practice and separate in company from those who followed Jesus? Does his testimony to our Lord, as narrated in the Fourth Gospel, admit of reconciliation with the Synoptic record? If so, how are we to interpret the question sent from the dungeon of Machaerus? What did the Johannine rite of baptism involve, and why did our Lord avail Himself of it in His own Person?

These questions are, indeed, not new. Some of them have been discussed at length by experts. Yet it can scarcely be said that even the experts have answered them satisfactorily. They also have been apt to pass swiftly from such matters to the central theme of the Gospels, they also have been drawn away irresistibly to the study of the supreme Person. Yet, apart from its own interest, a closer knowledge of the Baptist's ministry might help us to realize better the setting of our Lord's earthly life, and to understand more clearly the characters of the men who were disciples of John before they became disciples of Jesus. An adequate study of the theme could not be compressed into a brief paper, even were the present writer competent to undertake it. He must be content merely to indicate a few of the points that arise in connexion with it, hoping that others may pursue the inquiry, and that this section of the Gospel narratives may gain increased attention, alike from the expert and the general reader.

I.

Beyond doubt, John's mission was enormously successful. How are we to account for that success ?

An interval of about thirty years, apparently, separated his birth from his "showing unto Israel." Then he comes before us with the dramatic suddenness of his prototype, Elijah. He preaches and baptizes. Multitudes are drawn to him. Outspoken as his message is, and at variance with much that every Jew thought elemental in his religion, it provokes no open hostility.[1] Even some of the Pharisees are among his hearers. If his unsparing comments stirred their anger, they were afraid to show it, so powerful was his influence ; all men counted John a prophet. The Gospels give us, obviously, no more than a very condensed summary of his message, but that summary scarcely affords us, at first sight, a clue to John's remarkable success. There seems little in his teaching to differentiate it from that of the older prophets, whose imagery and doctrine he is content to borrow. Curiosity, no doubt, would bring many to hear him ; a curiosity stimulated by the reports of his asceticism, and by the claim to the prophetic office which his attire implied. Again, it is psychologically true that no form of eloquence is more widely attractive than a scathing denunciation of contemporary morals. Those who listen are as swift to relish its arraignment of their neighbours as they are slow to recognize its application to themselves. But John's success went far beyond gaining a curious and eager audience. That was a feat comparatively easy ; it was a very different achievement so to move the crowds that they confessed their sins and submitted to baptism. When John swept aside contemptuously that pride of race as God's covenanted people which lay at the heart of their creed,

[1] Although "δαιμόνιον ἔχει" was said of John, as afterwards of his Master (Matt. xi. 18).

they listened without remonstrance. Even such a phrase as "God is able of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham" stirred no protest. These facts are surely remarkable.

The truth seems to be that the attractiveness of the Baptist's preaching lay, to a great extent, in its daring novelty. And, paradox as it sounds, the essence of that novelty was its resemblance to the teaching of the Old Testament prophets. The general reader, turning over but a single page of his Bible to pass from the words of Old Testament prophecy to the words of John, forgets that they are really sundered by an interval of four centuries, fertile in changes of creed and thought. Those changes had been intensely reactionary. The liberalism of Jeremiah's attitude towards the Gentiles had been replaced by intensified racial exclusiveness. Apocalyptic, while emphasising the concept of a Messianic kingdom, had relegated it to a future beyond this world or had diminished the importance of a divine Messiah as a factor in its advent. "From the time of Ezra and Nehemiah," writes Canon Charles,[1] "the Law has not only assumed the functions of the ancient pre-exilic prophets, but it has also, so far as lay in its power, made the revival of such prophecy an impossibility." And, as legalism became increasingly predominant, apocalyptic was driven to entrench itself first in anonymity and then in pseudonymity. "Against the reception of fresh faith and truth the Law stood in the way, unless the books containing them came under the ægis of certain great names in the past . . . All Jewish apocalypses from 200 B.C. onwards were of necessity pseudonymous, for the Law was everything, belief in inspiration was dead, and the Canon was closed." [2]

To recollect these facts is to understand the audacious

[1] *Between the Old and the New Testaments*, p. 40.
[2] Ibid., pp. 42, 45.

novelty of the Baptist's claim and message, and to realise their compelling force in gaining the public ear. John dared, as none else had done for centuries, to deliver apocalyptic under his own name. He revived the Messianic hope, and instead of relegating the Kingdom to the next world, or to a dim future in this, asserted it to be already at hand. He announced that it was about to come on earth through the immediate advent of a Messiah. Yet his preaching was not confined to this arresting and personal apocalyptic message. He came to prepare, as well as to proclaim, the way of the Lord. With his apocalyptic he conbined an ethical message, for a parallel to which we must look back beyond the apocalyptic period. He broke down the restrictions of legalism by reviving the office of a prophet. His prophetic doctrine was more liberal than that of any among his Old Testament predecessors. Such, then, was the voice which rang forth at a time when, as it had seemed, prophecy was dead, apocalyptic was dying, and rigid legalism had triumphed.[1] We need not wonder that the courage and novelty of such teaching drew crowds to hear it. Having come, they found that it stirred the moral sense in man as the Law could not. The Kingdom is at hand, John taught, but the relationship with God it requires is personal, not racial; a transformed heart and will, not mechanical obedience to a code, are the conditions of a place within it. The consciences of the people were touched, they realised their moral failure; they confessed their sins; they were baptized.

II.

But what was the precise import of baptism in their case? And why was our Lord baptized by John?

[1] "The law meant the letter not as the expression of, but as substitute for the Spirit. Righteousness was the scrupulous observance of forms that had killed the life they were instituted to keep alive."—Du Bose, *The Gospel in the Gospels*, p. 109.

On no point in his teaching did John insist with more emphasis than the inferiority of his baptism "with water" as contrasted with that of Christ "with the Holy Ghost" (all four Gospels) "and with fire" (Matthew, Luke).[1] The earliest definition of the rite describes it as *βάπτισμα μετανοίας εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν*, translated by the R.V. "the baptism of repentance unto remission of sins" (Mark i. 4). The Matthæan variant "I baptize with water unto repentance" (Matt. iii. 11) seems simpler, though the objection has been raised that repentance "can hardly have been the *object* of the rite, for it was preceded by a confession of sin."[2] But the answer, surely, is that *μετάνοια* involves a definite resolve of amendment as well as confession, and of such a resolve John's baptism well may have been the outward pledge. We are bound, however, to face the difficulties of the earlier and, probably, more correct version. How could the Johannine baptism be "unto remission of sins" before the Passion of our Lord? We can scarcely accept the patristic theory that it was fully equivalent to Christian baptism, but its effect remained latent, so to speak, in the baptized until Christ had died. Modern commentators incline to the view that John's baptism was merely preparatory; it symbolised a state of penitence, and to become penitent was a step towards fitness for receiving the forgiveness which our

[1] The significance of this latter phrase (*καὶ πυρί*) has been the theme of much discussion. That it is a prediction of the Pentecostal tongues of fire seems most unlikely. Even more strained is the suggestion that Christ's baptism, in John's view, would be twofold; of the Holy Ghost to the penitent, of penal fire to the impenitent. May we not regard *καὶ πυρί* as almost pleonastic, as an expansion of *πνεύματι ἁγίῳ* while forming an antithesis to *ὕδατι*? We might translate "with the fire of the Holy Ghost"; cf. "with the Holy Ghost and with power" of Acts x. 38. Most of the commentators seem to have overlooked the fact that Luke, while giving the addition *καὶ πυρί* in his Gospel, twice omits it in Acts (i. 5, vi. 16). He could scarcely have done this had it possessed any independent significance not implied by *ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ*.

[2] Barr, *Hastings, D.B.*, ii. 679.

Lord would bring. Thus it was "a baptism of repentance leading towards a subsequent remission of sins." That may seem an adequate interpretation if we think only of the people baptized by John, but it makes the fact that Christ was baptized more puzzling than ever. The sinless One had no need of repentance, or to fit Himself to receive forgiveness of sins.

But let us remember the exact words: *εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν.* Are we quite certain that *ἄφεσις* does, in this instance, mean "forgiveness," i.e., "remission by God"? Certainly *ἀφίημι* and its derivatives are used in a wide variety of senses. Literally, of course, the verb means to "send away from oneself," and this, its fixed significance in classical Greek, is retained occasionally in the New Testament (*e.g.* of "putting away" a wife, 1 Cor. vii. 11–13). Then, by an easy transition, it comes to mean "to leave," or "forsake": "We have left all, and followed Thee," cries St. Peter; *ἀφήκαμεν πάντα.* Is it not at least possible that the substantive may bear sometimes a sense cognate to this? Thus *ἄφεσις ἁμαρτιῶν* means literally a "sending away" of sins. No doubt it is often used to describe the working of Divine grace. But there is no etymological reason why it should not be used also to signify human effort, why, in short, its true rendering here should not be "renunciation"—"sending away" by man—rather than "remission"—"putting away" by God. The latter meaning would be more natural when describing the events of a date when our Lord had not begun His work and teaching.[1] And if *ἄφεσις* does mean here "renunciation" of wrong, consecration of the will to resist temptation and to serve

[1] Surely also it elucidates the sentence in the Benedictus, *τοῦ δοῦναι γνῶσιν σωτηρίας τῷ λαῷ αὐτοῦ ἐν ἀφέσει ἁμαρτιῶν αὐτῶν*, where it is most natural to take *ἐν ἀφέσει ἁμαρτιῶν* with *γνῶσιν*. John did not give "remission of sins." But repentance and renunciation of sin fitted the people to receive knowledge of salvation,

God, we are able to understand better both the nature of John's baptism and the reason of Christ's submission to it. In the case of the people, John's preaching reawakened the sense of moral failure and produced contrition. Contrition gave proof of its reality by confession. And then came baptism,[1] the pledge of a new life purified from the past, the dramatic sign that the baptized dedicated himself henceforward to correspond with the moral law of God. In the case of our Lord, there was no need of contrition or confession. But, now that He was about to begin His Messianic work, there was a need that He should definitely consecrate Himself to the performance of His Father's will, should pledge Himself to renounce and resist evil in that overwhelmingly real struggle with it which was so soon to follow.

If this was the personal reason for His Baptism, there was another also :—the wish to ratify John's message. For the essence of that message, as we have seen, was the truth that "righteousness," the δικαιοσύνη which was the Jewish ideal, the quality which could keep man in his covenant-relation with God, must be the fruit of character, not of an external obedience to a code. John, then, gave δικαιοσύνη a new interpretation—or, to speak more accurately, he revived an interpretation the prophets had given and legalism had obscured. His baptism was the outward sign of this inward δικαιοσύνη. When (as Matthew alone narrates [2]) John demurred to baptizing Christ, He insisted,

[1] The Pharisees coming to John's baptism wished to use it as a substitute for, not as a sequel to, contrition.

[2] But the passage has every mark of genuineness, and Matthew, writing for Jewish Christians, would naturally be more anxious than the other evangelists to place on record our Lord's words concerning the fulfilment of δικαιοσύνη. Luke treats the descent of the Spirit and the voice from Heaven as the important facts ; the baptism he mentions, quite casually as it were, in a participle ; "ἐγένετο . . . Ἰησοῦ βαπτισθέντος καὶ προσευχομένου, ἀνεῳχθῆναι τὸν οὐρανόν," κ.τ.λ.

because *οὕτω πρέπον ἐστὶν ἡμῖν πληρῶσαι πᾶσαν δικαιοσύνην*.[1] This phrase has been variously interpreted, but surely the clue to it is given by the parallel statement in the Sermon on the Mount that Christ was not come to destroy the Law, *ἀλλὰ πληρῶσαι*.[2] He was come to fulfil the Law and the prophets, He was come to fulfil "all righteousness," to show the whole of their true significance. The task which He and the Baptist shared ("it becometh *us*") was to rescue *δικαιοσύνη* from the narrow and false interpretation fastened upon it by legalism. And so afterwards He taught that entrance into the Kingdom was conditioned by a *δικαιοσύνη* greater than that which the scribes and Pharisees claimed.[3]

If, then, we ask why our sinless Master was baptized by John, the answer would seem to be not that He wished, in this obscure way, to hallow by anticipation Christian baptism—from which John's rite was entirely distinct,—or that He underwent a "baptism for the remission of sins," which, in His case, would be meaningless, but that His baptism was (*a*) the personal consecration of Himself at the outset of His Messianic work to do His Father's will and to resist temptation; (*b*) the endorsement of John's teaching concerning the real nature of *δικαιοσύνη*. And upon this act of His followed the descent of the Holy Spirit and the benediction of the Father. Human effort and Divine power were perfectly blended; in their strength our Lord entered upon His work.

III.

Other points of extreme interest in connexion with the Baptism belong to the story of our Lord rather than to that of John. Let us pass on to consider, very briefly, the Baptist's attitude towards our Lord.

[1] Matt. iii. 15. [2] Ibid., v. 17. [3] Ibid., v. 20.

Too much has been made, I venture to think, of the supposed discrepancy on this subject between the Synoptic accounts and the narrative of the Fourth Gospel. It is perfectly true that John did not seem before the Baptism and its Sign to recognise in Jesus the Messiah whom he expected. In fact, his teaching up to that date, while it describes the coming Messiah as mightier than himself and the executor of a Divine judgment, does not imply that the Messiah must necessarily be other than human. Again, his protest before the Baptism, while emphasising his conviction that Jesus was morally greater than himself, is not worded as it would have been had he been consciously addressing the Son of God. But this, so far from being at variance with the statements of the Fourth Gospel, is explicitly confirmed by them. "I knew Him not," confesses the Baptist, and then repeats and amplifies this word :[1] "I have beheld the Spirit descending as a dove out of heaven, and it abode upon Him. And I knew Him not: but He that sent me to baptize with water, He said unto me, Upon whomsoever thou shalt see the Spirit descending, and abiding upon Him, the same is He that baptizeth with the Holy Spirit. And I have seen, and have borne witness that this is the Son of God."

Unless we arbitrarily reject the whole story of the Spirit's descent and the Voice from Heaven (recorded by all four evangelists), may we not take this straightforward explanation as adequate? The Synoptists, then, give us John's view of Christ before that Sign; the Fourth Gospel his view after it. The really incredible thing would be that such a Sign should have made no difference, that it should have brought no conviction that here was indeed the Son of God.

[1] St. John i. 31, 32. The "I," as Westcott points out, is emphatic. "I, His precursor, I, who should have been more swift than any other to recognise in Him the fulfilment of my message, I knew Him not."

The ground taken by some critics, however, for rejecting the Fourth Gospel's statement of the Baptist's faith is its alleged inconsistency with the question sent by him from prison. If, they urge, John had clearly recognised our Lord as the Divine Messiah, he could not afterwards have asked, "Art thou he that cometh, or look we for another?" But armchair criticism of this type forgets the facts of human nature. It was one thing to believe when in the actual presence of our Lord; it was quite another to keep that faith unshaken during the weariness of imprisonment. And, strained as John's belief was while those sad days dragged on, it was never broken. Some writers have held that John's patience, rather than his faith, was affected; that he grew restive as the prophecy of an immediate judgment upon the impenitent which he had given remained without fulfilment. Others, from Chrysostom to Dr. Bebb, have held (in the words of the latter [1]) that "we can hardly believe, after the terms applied by him to Christ in St. John, that his own faith wavered, and must suppose that he wished some confirmation of Christ's Messiahship to be given for the sake of his disciples." But that theory, as Dr. Plummer has shown,[2] is contradicted by the text. Our Lord's reply is not "Observe for yourselves," but "go and tell John"; not "blessed are they," but "blessed is he." Yet Dr. Plummer is surely mistaken in speaking of "the rebuke" to John conveyed by Christ's answer. John's faith was strained, yet it held. He felt the tendency to doubt; he did not disbelieve, else had he not sent his question to Christ. And Christ's answer ends not with a "rebuke" but with a beatitude; not "woe to him that stumbleth," but "blessed is he that shall not stumble." Nothing will so confirm the belief of John as the knowledge that Christ still believes in him, is assured that his faith will not fail.

[1] Hastings' *D.B.*, ii. 680. [2] *Internat. Crit. Comm.*, St. Luke, p. 202.

And then our Lord turns to the multitudes to speak that magnificent eulogy upon John, the first sentence of which seems expressly framed to counteract any risk of their misunderstanding John's question—as, afterwards, it was misunderstood: "Do you suppose that John has lost his faith? Is he the kind of man who would do that? Think of John, as you knew him, think of the power which drew you out into the wilderness. Was he a weak, vacillating man? What went ye out for to see? A reed shaken by the wind?"

It was at the Baptist's own suggestion, clearly, that certain of his disciples left him to walk with Jesus. But others remained. We can easily understand and honour the feeling of loyalty which bound them to their old teacher. His death would but accentuate their resolve to perpetuate his memory, to maintain his doctrine, to baptize according to his rite, to use the prayers which he had taught them.[1] Moreover, they did not understand the methods of Christ. His liberalism seemed to them a decline from the rigid asceticism of John. They could not easily follow One who was termed "a gluttonous man and a winebibber." "Why do John's disciples and the disciples of the Pharisees fast, but Thy disciples fast not?" For a long period of years John's tradition maintained its independent existence, and we find both Apollos at Corinth and "disciples" at Ephesus "knowing only the baptism of John."

But this subject, like most of the points touched on in this paper, deserve a fuller examination than as yet it has received. And I feel sure that the effect upon any one undertaking such study—or even trying to trace in outline what John the Baptist was and did—will be to make him realise more clearly than before both how great was the man and how important his work.

ANTHONY C. DEANE.

[1] Luke xi. 1.

"*THOUGHTS ON INFANT BAPTISM.*"

In the March number of the Expositor, Professor Mackintosh discourses with his customary charm and lucidity and persuasiveness on "Infant Baptism." It is significant that Dr. Mackintosh should feel it necessary to write an almost passionate defence of the practice of baptizing infants. But inasmuch as he says frankly, "Infant Baptism is not enjoined in the New Testament, nor is there any New Testament record of its prevalence," perhaps it is not surprising that the necessity should be felt for justifying such a departure from New Testament practice. Probably this necessity is emphasised by our increasing knowledge of the ecclesiastical conditions of the world. In England and Scotland Baptists are merely one of the larger Nonconformist denominations. But in the United States the Baptists have over 6,000,000 Church members and vie with the Methodists as the largest Church in North America; whilst the deeply interesting evangelical movement in Eastern Europe, which has created a Baptist Church of over 60,000 members in Russia and of over 25,000 in Hungary—numbers likely to be enormously increased now that religious liberty has come in Russia—gives evidence of the vigour of that view of Baptism which preserves the ordinance for those able to make a personal profession of their faith in Jesus Christ. Therefore it may not be out of place to add to the "Thoughts about Infant Baptism" expressed so clearly by Professor Mackintosh, some other thoughts from another standpoint. Every Baptist must note with appreciation that the article deals with the subjects of Baptism and not with the mode. May we not hope that the bad old days are over when differences between Christians on this important matter were explained by poor

jokes about Baptists' love of water? This Sacrament has suffered in much the same way as the book of Jonah. The story of the great fish swallowing Jonah has focussed attention and made readers miss the evangelical beauty of the book. The whale has swallowed not only the prophet but also the prophetic message. So because many Christians maintain the Scriptural practice of immersion instead of substituting sprinkling, the question of mode has swallowed up the vital question of the subjects. Dr. Mackintosh recognises that the vital difference of opinion is not as to sprinkling or immersion, but as to whether infants should be baptized or believers. Not "infants or adults." Who believes in adult baptism? Does anyone? Certainly Baptists do not. "Adolescent Baptism" would be a much more accurate term. The opposite to infant baptism is not adult baptism, but the baptism of those old enough to make a personal, intelligent profession of faith in the Lord Jesus Christ. Such a profession is usually made in the critical years of adolescence—a fact recognised by the practice of the Church of England of confirming young people then.

Confirmation in the Church of England and Baptism in the Baptist Church usually take place at about the same age. There can be no certainty as to the age. Belief may not come until adult life is reached; it may not come even until old age. In such cases Baptism must be postponed until the essential condition of personal faith is present. But the question, as Dr. Mackintosh sees, is between Infant Baptism and Adolescent Baptism. Are babes to be baptized or believers?

The answer to this question is to be found surely along the line which Dr. Mackintosh has indicated. We are getting at the right standpoint for discussing this matter when we ask, what is the significance of Baptism? Probably

there would not be much desire, even amongst Baptists, to quarrel with Dr. Mackintosh's contention that the form of Baptism practised by the Church must be that "to which the Church was led by the progress of its experience illumined by the Spirit." Certainly we concur heartily in the following sentence: "and its justification consists in a complete harmony with the interior sense of the Christian Gospel." If there are grave objections to Infant Baptism, these objections must be discovered in the significance of the Sacrament. The question to be discussed is, in Dr. Mackintosh's words, Is Baptism appropriate to infants? And the answer can only be formed by discovering the "interior sense" of the rite.

What then, is Dr. Mackintosh's own account of the significance of Baptism? "Infant Baptism," he says, "is thoroughly and characteristically evangelical, inasmuch as it symbolises, significantly expresses and conveys, the prevenient grace of God. It stands for the priceless truth: 'Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that He loved us!'"

Certainly this truth is priceless: it does indeed "embody the very core of Christianity." But the question to be considered is whether this is the truth which Baptism was designed to set forth. The Church has received from her Lord two Sacraments. Both Sacraments must be in harmony with the Evangel. Both must conform in spirit to the very core of Christianity. But is not the *raison d'être* of the sacraments that they were instituted to set forth some specific aspect of truth, and therefore are connected with definite periods in Christian experience? The Lord's Supper is also "thoroughly and characteristically evangelical." It embodies the very core of Christianity. It declares the love of God even more plainly than Baptism. But that does not make it a sacrament for infants. Indeed it

is difficult to avoid asking Dr. Mackintosh why he makes no reference to Infant Communion? "Children are a disconcerting fact to many theories": granted! But why are children only a disconcerting fact to Believers' Baptism and not to Believers' Communion? We do not limit the prevenient grace of God, by not bringing infants to the Lord's Supper. The glorious shining of His love in Christ is not dimmed because believers only gather at the Holy Table. It is recognised that the Sacrament has a definite meaning. Its significance does not permit of its being offered to infants. It remains utterly evangelical though it is restricted in usage: indeed it is through its restricted usage that its evangelical message is revealed. When the Lord's Supper is offered to infants, it ceases to be an evangelical sacrament and becomes a magical snare.

Does not the same reasoning apply to Baptism? There is no limiting of the Evangel when Baptism is offered to believers and not to infants. The whole question is, what aspect of the Evangel does Baptism emphasise? Can this particular sacrament be applied to infants if it retains its own particular significance? Is there not a danger lest it, too, should become a magical snare, if it is divorced from its New Testament meaning? Has not that happened when the rite has become associated with the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration?

So we are brought back to an inquiry as to the correct significance of Baptism. Now Dr. Mackintosh urges some very true and beautiful things about the love of God for children and about the place of children in the love and care of the Church. But what we are concerned with now is the significance attaching to the ordinance of Baptism. What was the New Testament teaching about the ordinance, and what has been the historical interpretation of Baptism in the Christian Church?

It is significant that Dr. Mackintosh goes back for his defence to the Reformation. He relies upon Luther's "religious instinct." But is it sufficient to go back only to the Reformation? Baptism is as old as Christianity. It was instituted by Christ Himself; it was practised universally in the Christian Church from the outset of its career. Therefore, in trying to understand the meaning of Baptism, we must go behind the Reformation, behind the mediæval ages, back to the New Testament and to the Apostolic and sub-Apostolic Church.

And here we may be much helped by the articles on Baptism in Hastings' *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics* and *Bible Dictionary*. The former is specially valuable for our present purpose because it deals in separate articles with "New Testament Baptism," "Early Christian Baptism," and "Later Christian Baptism." The first, by Professor Vernon Bartlet, gives the significance of Baptism thus: "It denoted (1) the convert's attitude towards his past sinful state with its dead works—repentance; and (2) his new attitude—faith towards God or Christ. The practical effect was remission of past sins or justification, the token of which was the gift of the Holy Spirit, in sensible experience, as marking Divine acceptance of the new subject of Messiah's Kingdom." Dr. Plummer's summary in *H.D.B.* is: "Scripture teaches that baptism rightly administered to those who are qualified by repentance and faith to receive it has various beneficial results. They are mainly (1) Regeneration or New Birth, (2) Divine Affiliation, (3) Cleansing from Sin, (4) Admission to the Church, (5) Union with Christ, (6) Gift of the Spirit, (7) Salvation." Professor Kirsopp Lake, in the article on "Early Christian Baptism," is even more explicit. Concerning Baptism in the New Testament, he indicates four ways in which Baptism is regarded in the Pauline Epistles. (*a*) Union with Christ;

(*b*) the gift of the Spirit; (*c*) cleansing from sin; and (*d*) vicarious baptism (i.e. "for the dead"). His summary of the doctrine of Baptism "in the 1st and 2nd centuries" says: "The dominant ideas were those of forgiveness of sin, regeneration, and the gift of the Holy Spirit. . . . In baptism the Christian passes from one sphere of life to another. He is born again to another world [where] he is under the control of the Holy Spirit."

Mr. Wood opens the article on "Later Christian Baptism," by quoting Harnack's words: "Since the middle of the second century the notions of Baptism in the Church have not essentially altered. The result of Baptism was universally considered to be forgiveness of sins, and this pardon was supposed to effect an actual sinlessness which now required to be maintained." Discussing the origin of infant Baptism the author points out that the Pelagian theory that infants were baptized, not in order that their sins might be forgiven but in order that they might be sure of admission into the Kingdom of Heaven, introduced two baptisms—"as clear a heresy as re-baptism itself." Coming to the Reformation Period, the article discusses the Reformers' conception of Grace and Faith; and sums up the situation thus: "Not many Protestants were prepared to draw the logical conclusion and abandon the practice of infant Baptism. A threefold division of the Reformed Churches followed. (*a*) There were those who confined Baptism to adults or rather to conscious believers. (*b*) Some Churches retained infant baptism, and fell back on earlier ideas of baptismal regeneration. The Lutheran and Anglican Churches represent this tendency. (*c*) Yet other Churches retained the custom, but altered its significance."

As to (*b*), it is said of Luther that "he fell back on the Roman doctrine. He strove to retain the connexion between Faith and Baptism by continuing the *interrogatio de*

Fide and the presence of sponsors in the rite, and by supposing that there is a kind of faith bestowed on infants."

The general suggestion is that at the time of the Reformation, the significance of Baptism was changed by the Churches which retained the practice of baptizing infants but wished to harmonise the practice with "Reformed" doctrine. There was no infant Baptism in the early Church. Professor Bartlet, at the close of his article on New Testament Baptism (*l.c.*) naïvely remarks: "So far we have been dealing with adult Baptism only. It alone occupies attention in the New Testament, as it does mainly in missionary literature to-day." It might be worth while asking, in passing, when would the question of baptizing infants first arise in the Church, if the ordinance was intended originally for them? Evidently well within New Testament times. There must have been babes born to Christian parents within a very few years of the foundation of the Church. Is it suggested that there were no Christian fathers and mothers till the second century? But if children were born to Christian parents in apostolic times, must there not have been some reflection of the practice of infant Baptism in the New Testament, if it were practised in the Church? As a matter of fact, in missionary work the question arises at once. And the strange fact is that on some mission fields to-day two kinds of baptism are being practised side by side by the same missionaries: (*a*) that of believers as a profession of their faith, and (*b*) that of babes, as a kind of dedication service or as a service having quite a different meaning from the other baptism.

Perhaps it is enough to quote Dr. Mackintosh's own words: "The passage dealing with mixed marriages in 1 Corinthians (vii. 12–16) plainly indicates that in the Apostolic Age it had not occurred to any of the religious leaders that children should be baptized even when the

father or mother was a Christian." Dr. Kirsopp Lake (*l.c.*) says tersely, "There is no indication of the baptism of children."

But before the Reformation, the baptism of infants had become well-nigh universal. What were the Reformers to do? Reformed doctrine did not square with infant baptism if baptism retained its historical significance. Various expedients were tried: and Mr. Wood describes them. The Lutheran and Anglican Churches retained infant baptism and fell back on earlier ideas of baptismal regeneration. They tried somehow to make faith still the introduction to baptism.

Let us illustrate this by referring to Article XXVII. of the Articles of Religion of the Church of England. "Baptism is not only a sign of profession and mark of difference whereby Christian men are discerned from others that be not christened, but it is also a sign of Regeneration or new Birth whereby, as by an instrument, they that receive Baptism are grafted into the Church; the promises of forgiveness of sin, and of our adoption to be sons of God by the Holy Ghost are visibly signed and sealed, Faith is confirmed and Grace increased by virtue of prayer unto God." Here are the same truths as were emphasised in New Testament Baptism, viz.: membership of the Church, forgiveness of sins, newness of life. Then the Article goes on to say: "The Baptism of young children is in any wise to be retained in the Church, as most agreeable with the institution of Christ." This sentence has an obvious apologetic tone; and if we turn to the "Catechism," light is thrown upon it. The answer to the question "What is the inward and spiritual grace in Baptism?" is, "A death unto sin and a new birth unto righteousness; for being by nature born in sin and the children of wrath, we are hereby made the children of grace." Question: "What is required

of persons to be baptized?" Answer: "Repentance, whereby they forsake sin, and Faith, whereby they stedfastly believe the promises of God made to them in the Sacrament." Here there is a wide divergence from Dr. Mackintosh's view. By advocating the Baptism of Infants, he implies that there is no necessity for repentance and faith by the person to be baptized. And the Church of England Catechism recognises the difficulty. For its next—and very natural—question is, "Why then are infants baptized when by reason of their tender age they cannot perform them?" Answer: "Because they promise them both by their sureties, which promise, when they come to age, themselves are bound to perform."

One may urge, therefore, that the Church of England symbol, like that of the Presbyterian Church, interprets Baptism to signify forgiveness and regeneration and union with Christ and His Church. Consistently, it demands repentance and faith in the baptized; and as these are impossible in infants, it bridges the gulf by the help of sureties or sponsors.

But "the intention of infant baptism did not always mean the restoration of the older interpretation of the practice. The Puritans in England objected to the institution of godfathers and godmothers. In the form of baptism adopted in Geneva there are no sponsors, and no profession of faith is made on behalf of the child." Mr. Wood then quotes the order for the administration of Baptism in the Presbyterian Church of England, based on the Westminster Confession, as showing no attempt to preserve the connexion between faith and Baptism by a vicarious declaration of faith.

This repudiation of sponsors is an inevitable concession to the evangelical interpretation of infant Baptism. But what takes their place? Their ability to promise repent-

ance and faith for the baptized infant is the fiction by which the Church of England bridges the gulf between its evangelical doctrine and its sacramentarian practice. Probably those Evangelicals are wiser who refuse to use such a rickety bridge. But how do they propose to cross the gulf?

The answer is given by Dr. Mackintosh in scholarly language and some free writing: it is a surrender of the New Testament ordinance of Baptism. He does not cross the gulf but frankly abandons the attempt. The same answer is given much more bluntly by other Evangelicals. In the article already quoted on "Later Christian Baptism," Mr. Wood says of the Presbyterian service: "In baptism the parents solemnly engage themselves to bring up the child in the fear of the Lord. The Wesleyan Church, which did not start from the Calvinist basis, but made much of conversion, retains infant Baptism in a similar sense. To the Congregationalists infant Baptism is little more than a dedication service. The Calvinist Churches generally, and some other bodies, have thus retained the practice and altered its meaning."

With regard to the ordinary practice of the Churches concerned, this is, I believe, a perfectly accurate summary; and it is confirmed by Dr. Mackintosh's "Thoughts about Infant Baptism." It would be impertinent to apply to that article Dr. Mackintosh's own description of the Reformation leaders: "their exegetical and at times their doctrinal arguments are surprisingly weak." But is it not fair to say that the gist of his article is a plea that Baptism has changed its meaning, "whether defended by good scriptural or doctrinal arguments matters little" to quote him again against himself! Beyond all doubt he is the spokesman for many modern Evangelicals. It is quite a usual thing now for ministers of the Free Churches to explain "Infant Baptism" as a Dedication Service. Recently I was privi-

leged to address a large gathering of ministers of one of the Methodist bodies. I described the Dedication Service which I conduct and which is quite common in Baptist Churches now. They agreed that there was scarcely any difference between such a service and their own, which, they said frankly, was a Dedication Service only. Such a service is probably useful. Baptists have erred by not giving infants some place in the Service of the Church. But will any one maintain that New Testament Baptism was an Infant Dedication Service? or that the historical teaching of the Church about Baptism allows such an interpretation? All that Dr. Mackintosh says about the claims of children and all that Free Churchmen say about Dedication, may be perfectly true. But that is not the significance of Christian Baptism. And the question really becomes one as to whether we are to surrender Baptism with its profound significance, and substitute a Dedication Service for a Sacrament? Or shall the Christian Sacrament of Baptism be preserved, and suitable provision be made in the services of the Church for recognising the claims of infants on the Church's care and love?

Moreover, it must be remembered that whatever individual Evangelicals say in defence of their practice, the "official" teaching about Baptism in these Churches knows nothing about "Dedication." Dr. Mackintosh belongs to the Church whose recognised symbol is the Westminster Confession of Faith. Article XXVIII. deals with Baptism. It reads: "Baptism is a sacrament of the New Testament ordained by Jesus Christ, not only for the solemn admission of the party baptized into the visible Church, but also to be unto him a sign and seal of the covenant of grace, of his ingrafting into Christ, of regeneration, of remission of sins, and of his giving up unto God through Jesus Christ, to walk in newness of life, which sacrament is, by Christ s own

appointment, to be continued in the Church until the end of the world." Can such an interpretation of Baptism stand on an evangelical basis, when Baptism is applied to infants? and what sort of harmony is there between its statements and those of Professor Mackintosh? Here is the clear teaching that Baptism is ordained for the solemn admission of the baptized into the visible Church; that it is a seal to the baptized of regeneration, of remission of sins and of his giving up unto God in newness of life. That is not the parents' dedication of the infant: it is the baptized person's dedication of himself. And that, we claim, is the New Testament and historical significance of Baptism. If space permitted, many quotations could be given to show that when Presbyterians are writing about Baptism, and are not trying to defend infant Baptism, like all other Evangelicals they take believers' Baptism for granted and use language in the New Testament sense. One sentence must suffice, from Professor Candlish's Handbook on *The Sacraments*: "By baptism we are incorporated not into any local or sectional Church only, but into the only holy Catholic Church of Christ, and we recognise all who have received that baptism in any of the parts or branches of the Christian Church as our brethren and fellow-Christians" (*l.c.* p. 57).

As to the Congregationalists, we remember the merciless way in which Dr. Dale denounced the interpretation of Baptism as a Dedication Service, saying that if that were all the practice meant, "it might as well be given up first as last."

Therefore the situation may be summed up, thus. The progress of Evangelical scholarship has finally scotched the old idea, to which Evangelicals clung, that infant Baptism was a New Testament practice, or that it is consonant with the pre-Reformation significance of the sacrament. Two

courses are open : (*a*) to retain the practice, giving it a new meaning ; (*b*) to retain the meaning, changing the practice. Those who practise infant Baptism follow the first course. Those who practise believers' Baptism, follow the second. In my judgment, the second course is the right course. It is dangerous work meddling with the two sacraments instituted by Jesus Christ. The history of the Mass proves that with regard to the Lord s Supper. The doctrine of baptismal regeneration proves it with regard to Baptism. Nor can it be denied that wherever infant Baptism is practised, some traces at least of that superstition cling to it. Any minister knows that parents will send for some one to baptize a child seriously ill, with a dim idea that an unbaptized babe is "unsaved." Moreover the baptism of infants is not confined by any Church to the children of Christian parents Every child is "christened" as a matter of course ; and the baptismal vows are made by parents whatever their Church connexion. It seems an altogether safer and wiser thing to keep the two sacraments as nearly as possible as Jesus gave them. Doctrine grows ; but the two sacraments cannot "grow" without becoming deformed.

If it is generally recognised that there has been this change in the interpretation of Baptism by those who practise infant Baptism, might it not be possible to bring about some mutual understanding which would end the separation between Evangelical Christians over this question ? Denominational divisions are almost all along lines of Church polity. But one denomination is separated from others by the interpretation of a sacrament. Differences of view on Church polity are to be expected and can be justified. Differences of view on one of the two sacraments ought not to be possible amongst Evangelicals. The baptismal formula was never intended to be the Shib-

boleth of a sect. It is far too wide and too Christian for that. It is the motto over the front door of the Church, not the notice affixed to any private room. If only Christians could get together for conference and prayer in the light of such a valuable article as that by Dr. Mackintosh, one can foresee the end of much useless recrimination at least, and the beginning of a better understanding of our differences. An optimist sees much more—sees the possibility of a working agreement, which gives recognition to both of the modern Evangelical views of Baptism.

Anyhow, we are agreed as to the prevenient grace of God; agreed as to the claims of child life upon the love and care of the Church; agreed as to the evangelical interpretation of the sacrament of Baptism. Some maintain that this involves believers' Baptism rather than infants' Baptism. But all welcome the demand for a "Dedication Service." What Baptists feel is that such a service is not big enough to fill the position given to Baptism by our Lord when He bade His Church "go into all the world and make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost"; or by the Apostle Paul when he wrote to the Roman Christians: "Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into His death? Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death; that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life."

One rises from the perusal of Dr. Mackintosh's article with the conviction that it would not have satisfied either the Apostle Paul or the Reformer Luther. But it sets Christians thinking, and it ought to lead us into a closer unity round that central message which was so dear to both Paul and Luther, and which is still dear to us. May it not serve as a rallying cry to Christians to gather their

forces for a new effort so to convey the gospel to our own children as to win them for the eternal Love which claims their faith and their obedience?

J. E. Roberts.

BAPTIZING WITH FIRE.

In all four Gospels and in the Acts importance is laid on the testimony of John the Baptist to his Successor, and portions of the discourse which contained that testimony are quoted. Those reports differ in various ways, some serious, some apparently trifling; such differences are to be explained by oral tradition, by authors trusting their memory instead of referring to written documents, or by their unwillingness to reproduce existing matter without alteration. The occurrence of the discourse in all these documents is however strong evidence of its historical basis, and the varieties in the reports do not affect this.

The following is a provisional arrangement in chronological order of the reports of two sentences:

1. Lewisian Syriac of Matthew iii. 11: *Now I baptize you with water unto repentance; but he that cometh after me is greater than I, he whose shoes I am not worthy to carry; he shall baptize you with fire and with holy spirit.*

2. Greek of the same: *I indeed baptize you with water unto repentance; but he that cometh behind me is stronger than I, whose shoes I am not fit to carry; he shall baptize you in holy spirit and fire.*

3. Luke iii. 16 (Greek): *I indeed with water baptize you; but there cometh he that is stronger than I, of whom I am not fit to loose the strap of his shoes; he shall baptize you in holy spirit and fire.*

4. Mark i. 7 (Greek): *There cometh he that is stronger*

than I behind me, of whom I am not fit to bend down and loose the strap of his shoes ; I baptized you with water, but himself shall baptize you in Holy Spirit.

5. John i. 26 (Greek) : *I baptize in water ; amidst you there stands whom ye know not, he that cometh behind me of whom I am not worthy that I should loose the strap of his shoe.*

6. Acts xiii. 25 : *But behold there cometh after me one the shoe of whose feet I am not worthy to loose.* i. 5 in the address of the Risen Saviour : *John indeed baptized with water, but ye in spirit—holy—shall be baptized after not many of these days.* Quoted as the Lord's saying in xi. 16 : *John indeed baptized with water but ye shall be baptized in holy spirit.*

It will be seen that the prophecy attributed to the Baptist has a tendency to diminish until in the latest report one part of it is attributed not to the Baptist, but to the Risen Saviour. The reason for this is to be found in another part of the Acts, where it is recorded (xix. 2, 3) that the historical followers of the Baptist had never heard of the existence of Holy Spirit ; it could scarcely therefore be a matter of common knowledge that their founder had prophesied baptism in Holy Spirit. The difficulty is recognized by the Author of the Acts, who therefore quotes the words not as spoken by John to his audience but by the Risen Saviour to the disciples ; and it is only the remainder of the passage that is attributed to the Baptist. In the fourth Gospel John is represented as identifying " Him who baptizes in Holy Spirit " (i. 33), whereas he himself had been sent to baptize in water, but apparently in a soliloquy ; the previous day a deputation of priests and Levites had been addressed ; the following day his testimony was heard by two disciples ; but no mention is made of any audience on the day whereon he uttered the words quoted. Hence according to this

presentation the prophecy might have been uttered by John, only it was not a matter of common knowledge that he had uttered it.

In the fourth Gospel it is stated that the deputation sent from Jerusalem to inquire into the claims of John consisted of Priests and *Levites*, and the question why he baptized, if he were neither Christ nor Elias nor the Prophet [of Deut. xviii. 18], is ascribed to certain Pharisees. The purpose of this statement is doubtless to indicate that the question implied some out-of-the-way knowledge ; and John's reply is that his baptism is with water, implying that the baptism which indicated Messiahship or the like was with another element. In this way John afterwards speaks of " Him who baptizes with Holy Spirit " as equivalent to the Messiah. It is probable that the question addressed by the Pharisees was based on Malachi iii. 3, where it is foretold that either he who is to prepare the way or " the Lord whom ye seek," the former of whom may well be identical with Elias (verse 23), shall *purify the sons of Levi*. The context certainly implies that this purification will be effected with fire ; it will be seen that in the chronological series of texts the earliest puts fire in the first place, in the next stage it is put after Holy Spirit, and in the next stage it is omitted. The descent of the Spirit at Pentecost, which, however interpreted, may be regarded as too well attested to be unhistorical, determined the interpretation of the baptism which superseded that of John, whence we find the fire omitted even in the form quoted in the Acts, though in the account of the miracle of Pentecost there is an allusion to it.

In the transition from the second to the third form the words *unto repentance* are omitted from John's account of his baptism ; the reason for this omission is to be found in the polemic of Josephus, who (*Antiquities*, xviii. v. § 2) denies that the baptism of John had this significance ; it

was, he asserts, for bodily cleanliness. In the fourth Gospel the purpose of the baptism is said to be the manifestation of the Lamb of God. Josephus in his *Autobiography* (§ 2) asserts that he in his youth lived with an ascetic who in many respects resembled John the Baptist, and practised frequent washing in cold water both day and night. If he is to be trusted—and unfortunately the statements of this author have always to be received with caution—the title Baptist as applied to John would be to be derived not from the transitive, but from the intransitive form of the verb,[1] and signify "the Bather," with the implication that his baptism was not an inaugural ceremony, but a constant practice. His statement "I baptize with water" would further mean that he taught such immersion as a practice to be followed rather than that he made proselytes undergo this ceremony as an indication of a change of life.

In the transition from the first text to the second the word *fire* is transposed and made to follow *Holy Spirit*. Merx observes with justice that the antithesis between water and fire is the more natural; whence he holds that the order of the Lewisian Syriac is right; and indeed what follows in the first and third Gospels appears to explain what is meant by baptizing with fire; it is the process of rendering grain suitable for the deduction of the priestly dues by winnowing, followed by burning the chaff and storing the grain; and indeed the phrase *Fire baptizes* is found in the Jewish Law[2] with reference to some process which has the same result, ordinarily however thought to be cooking. It might indeed be held that since the word rendered "Spirit" is also used for wind or air, and to its elemental sense attention is evidently directed in Acts i. 15,

[1] Compare λογιστής, σοφιστής.
[2] Jer. Maasroth, § 4 Gem.

the winnowing process is intended to be the interpretation of the form of Baptism to which reference is made; and the fire comes in the second place both in the statement and in the interpretation or illustration which follows. It seems more probable that the word *fire* stood first alone, was then interpreted in accordance with the scene described in Acts ii., was then transposed and finally omitted.

Whether the other changes exhibited in these texts are equally important is not clear. The Jewish oral tradition can be quoted for the assertion that both carrying the shoes and loosing the shoes were menial acts, indicating that the person who did them stood in the relation of slave to the person for whom they were done; this appears from the story told in B. *Kiddushin* 22*b*, where possession of a slave who is likely to be ownerless is secured by ordering him to remove the speaker's shoes and carry them into the house. Hence the form favoured by the last three Gospels and the Acts may not differ in import from that which appears in both texts of the first Gospel. The change from "fit" to "worthy" which appears in the text of the fourth Gospel and the Acts will then be merely the substitution of one synonym for another. On the other hand it is possible that the later texts all misunderstand the phrase employed by John. The words here used in the Greek and Syriac texts of Matthew are employed in those of Luke x. 4 in the sense of *wearing* shoes; and there is a proverb quoted in B. *Kiddushin* 49*a*, "I want not a shoe too great for my leg," meaning "I want not what is above my rank." If this be the correct interpretation of the phrase in Matthew, the sense will be not, "whose slave I am unworthy to be," but "whose function I am too feeble to discharge"; and it becomes very difficult to decide whether *greater* of the Syriac text or *stronger* of the Greek is the more

original. In the text of Mark either the Greek or the Syriac of the earlier text seems to have been definitely interpreted as " to lift up " rather than " to carry "—both words have both meanings; hence " bending down and loosing " is treated as the more respectful and indeed natural operation. The slight variations from this which the later texts exhibit have apparently no importance.

Baptizing or submerging in fire is an expression found in pagan Greek authors without reference to Christian technicalities, as in the romance of Achilles Tatius, where it is stated that the passions of love and anger are fires wherein the individual is alternately " baptized," i.e. submerged. If John identified his Successor with the " One that was to come " of Malachi iii. 1, 2, and this seems either certain or highly probable, the " fire " would be amply explained in that passage; " he is like a refiner's fire and fullers' soap." The other allusions to fire in John's discourse all have the same reference; they only illustrate in different ways the purification which he foretells. They assume that the First Coming was to be similar in character to what is associated with the Second Coming: trial by fire.

The introduction of the words " and Holy Spirit " into this discourse, which ultimately were substituted for the " fire " of the original, is likely to be due to the refutation of the belief that the First Coming was to be marked by the end of the world, and the new sense which the historical scene of Pentecost caused to be attached to the baptism of fire that had been foretold. Some trace of the word " fire " remains, as has been seen, in the first reference to these words in the Acts; in the second reference even this trace has disappeared.

The history of this part of the Baptist's discourse does not tend to reconcile the account of this person given by Josephus with that of the Gospels, wherein he has no

importance save as a forerunner, conscious that his mission was but preliminary to one of vastly greater importance. Nevertheless in the series of texts before us it is clear that this function of forerunner becomes more and more emphasised. Thus whereas in the texts of Matthew and Luke the prophecy of the " stronger " or " mightier One " comes after the statement " I baptize with water," in Mark (whose place in the chronological order is determined by his omission of the fire) it is placed at the very head of his message ; and in the fourth Gospel this is additionally emphasised. Similarly the identification of the Baptist with the " voice " foretold in Isaiah xl., which in Matthew appears as the combination of the Evangelist, in the fourth Gospel is treated as the Baptist's account of himself. The Lewisian text enables us to acquit Matthew of a charge of misinterpretation, which was clearly committed by the author of the second Gospel. The Lewisian of Matthew iii. 3 confines the quotation to the words *Prepare ye a way for the Lord*, taken from the Peshitta O.T., with one alteration (doubtless due to revision of the Syriac text) ; the Greek of Matthew introduces the whole verse from the LXX. of Isaiah, wherein the phrase *in the wilderness* seems to be wrongly attached to what precedes, whereas it should go with what follows : it thus makes the herald cry in the wilderness, whereas what is meant is that a path is to be cleared in the wilderness. It is true that the narrative even in the Lewisian Matthew commences *In those days came John the Baptist and was preaching in the wilderness of Judah ;* this wilderness is not however identified with that which is mentioned by Isaiah. The Greek omits the words *and was*, but is otherwise identical in sense ; the author of the third Gospel sees the difficulty and supposes the call to John to have come in the wilderness, in consequence whereof he went into the land about Jordan to preach. An earlier Syriac text than the

Lewisian might perhaps solve this difficulty finally. The second Gospel emphasises the identity of the wilderness where John baptized with that of the prophecy. In the fourth Gospel it is likely that the correct punctuation of the prophecy should be restored, as the location there given of the baptism is not suggestive of a " wilderness."

D. S. Margoliouth.

"FROM JAHVEH TO ELOHIM: FROM THE PARTICULAR TO THE UNIVERSAL."

THERE are two Psalms which, except in one particular, are absolutely the same,—the same ideas, the same words, concluding also with the same aspiration; I mean Psalms fourteen and fifty-three. Those who were responsible, under God, for bringing together the entire Book of Psalms as we have it, might very well have rejected one or other of these two psalms, as being redundant; but they allowed these two psalms to stand in spite of their similarity which is almost identity: and I wish to believe that it was for the sake of that one particular in which, with all their likeness, they differ. "There is not much difference," said a working man to the late Professor James of Harvard, "there is not much difference between one man and another, but what difference there is is very important." That is very true: it is the things in which we differ that disclose our personality. We are individuals not because of what we have in common, but because of what we have in contrast.

What then is the particular on which these two psalms, which are almost verbally alike, separate from one another? It is this: in the earlier psalm, the fourteenth, the Supreme Power is called Jehovah—Jahveh, which we translate "the Lord"; in psalm fifty-three, the Supreme Power is called throughout Elohim,—God.

In what follows I go upon the assumption that that is not a merely casual distinction; that, on the contrary, it marks the ascent of the religious spirit from a local and national and partial idea of God, to an idea ethical, universal, and eternal.

In psalm fourteen our eyes are confined to the fortunes of Israel as a nation; in psalm fifty-three we are invited to lift up our eyes over the whole earth. In psalm fourteen the welfare of Israel as a distinct community is the end and the object of our thought and of our prayers. Psalm fifty-three embraces the whole world in the righteous grasp of God.

Now this is the order of progress,—from the particular to the universal; from what has proved true and necessary in the narrower field of our own experience as individuals or as separate communities, to what must be true on the scale of this wide world, and of every world within God's universe.

It is not a thing to be ashamed of, or to apologise for, that the religious soul has advanced in the knowledge of its own ideas, that it has gone on from less to more, that at length it has perceived that what is true for itself is true for the whole world, and that, to put it conversely, *that* cannot be true for itself which cannot be held to be true for the whole world. We can trace everywhere in the Bible signs of what must have been an intense and angry struggle between what was merely tribal and local or at the best national in the faith of Israel, and what was permanent and universal in that faith. It must have been a long and hard struggle, as the struggle to a nobler idea of life always is. For there is no action of the human soul which demands such bravery, such utter faith, as to let go our hold of some truth, and for one dizzy moment to have no hold of anything, in order that we may lay hold of that same truth nearer to the heart of things, nearer to God. To feel that the God who loves us, who has been our special Providence, is not confined to us but has His purposes with all men,—that is a truth which even now it is hard for men to receive, and it is a truth which, in the childhood of any

race, even good men have shrunk from, for it seemed to them the loss of everything.

There is a great deal to be said for the view—to put this matter in the language of a warm and convinced faith—that God has committed to small nations, and to nations inhabiting mountainous and easily-defended territory, the task of watching over the cradle of great ideas and of nursing those ideas into youth and manhood. The idea of God, the agony and the glory alike which come from the direct relation between a Holy God and the subtleties and weaknesses of the human soul,—that seems to have been the task which the Eternal Spirit committed to Israel. To Greece, the Eternal Spirit seems to have committed the task of training the mind of man until it should perceive, and allow itself for ever to be guided or rebuked by, absolute standards in the region of intellectual truth and physical beauty. And it ought to be no mere matter of boasting or vanity on our part who believe that so it is, it ought to be the acceptance of a grave and responsible career among the nations of the earth,—that to us in these islands, girt and defended by seas, God committed the task of finding a formula for human government, making of our islands the early home of an ordered and responsible people.

But a nation attains to its manhood, and shows itself ready, if God wills, to undertake some further task in the region of ideas when it sees quite clearly, and rejoices to see, that the things which have been given to it are given not for its own private sake, but in order that they may become the common light and wisdom and amenity of the whole world.

A religious philosophy of history will not hesitate to declare that the great tragedies in the life of nations occurred when a nation sought to retain for its own purposes certain gifts or opportunities, instead of sharing those gifts and

opportunities with all who had become conscious of the need of them. It is from this point of view that the supreme tragedy in human history, the Crucifixion of our Lord on Calvary, was the violent breaking out of the Spirit of God on the whole world, overcoming the determined barriers of Jewish exclusiveness and prejudice. For there is no harder lesson for a nation to learn,—but the nation which has learned it has ensured its own immortality,—than the lesson underlying the words, "God is no respecter of persons."

"When I was a child," said the Apostle, "I spake as a child, I understood as a child, I thought as a child; but when I became a man I put away childish things." That should be the autobiography of every soul, and it should be the autobiography of every great people. It is true that we learn the great and deep things of life within narrow walls, in the chambers of our own soul, under the roof of our own home, within the frontier of our own country; but if what we have learned be true indeed, a day comes when we know that the only vindication of the truth we have learned is that we are ready to share it with the world, believing that it will bless the world to possess our truth as it has blessed us to this day.

"All roads lead to Rome"; and any serious consideration of the principles on which men and nations live leads inevitably to this great world-struggle in which we are still engaged. For when all is said, and getting away behind matters which we may believe belong to the confusion of the hour, the charge which we have to make against our enemies is that, with all their enlightenment, what they are proposing to do is to put back the clock in the region of personal and social and religious ideas. I have said that it is not a thing to be ashamed of, that the ideas by which we live to-day, the ideas by which we know we ought to live, first came home to

our souls in narrow and even desperate circumstances, if, having learned them in some early time of pressure, we see that they are to be used not for our own well-being only, but for the welfare and stability of the human race, for the increase of love and brotherhood in the world.

The thing for any man (or for any nation) to be ashamed of is for that man (or that nation), having once upon a time come within sight of truth, truth free and universal, thereafter to shut out that horizon, to turn his eyes in upon himself, to use that truth which has been given him in trust merely as a power for tyranny and oppression.

To return to these two psalms from which I set out; to rise from Jahveh to Elohim, from Jehovah the God of Israel to the God and moral Governor of the human race; to rise from the idea of a tribal deity who has no knowledge of other peoples, or if he has knowledge of them has only hatred towards them and an evil design; to rise from all that, to the conception of one God and Father of the whole human race, who demands the highest of us all, and who according to our faith is prepared to assist us towards the highest,—that is progress. But to invert all that; having had,—as no nation more truly than Germany has had, in its music, in its poetry, in its philosophy,—the vision of universal truth, to cease to regard herself as the servant of that truth, denying the authenticity of the vision which God has granted to the other great peoples of the earth; to erect anew local altars, and devote themselves to the adoration of a being of their own very features, and to attribute to that being their passions only, not allowing themselves to be rebuked or held back by the hard-won moral wisdom of the human race; to have repudiated the categorical imperative of their own greatest thinker, namely, that no man, and if no man then no body of men, has a right to behave himself otherwise than he would wish the whole world in the circumstances to

behave itself,—in short, having seen God,—one, universal, absolute, Critic and Judge of all human activity and passion, and then to go back to the worship of the tribe,—that is the proposed apostasy with which we charge our enemies, and it is a charge which we believe, later on, at the bar of history will be found to have been proved.

Well then, what is our answer in the region of ideas, and of the practice which ought to accompany those ideas and to proceed from them, what is the answer which we must make? Let us resist what will be, later on, a great temptation, for it will have many things to quote in its support, the temptation to fall into the very sin against which we are contending in our enemies. Let us more and more examine ourselves, examine the words we continually use to describe our ambitions and our policies, let us examine ourselves and all these things by this testing principle. We are here indeed to prosper in body, soul, and spirit; but we must take pains to see that our prosperity is not of such a kind that it comes to us over the prostrate or disabled body of any other people of the earth.

It may very well be that for years to come, and as a necessary precaution, we may have to close our ports to the friendly commerce of all nations of the earth. If that be so, it will always be something to look back upon with pride that for over seventy years we were the only nation of the earth which tried to live on the principle of unqualified hospitality,—the only nation of the earth which, in its deliberate policy, tried to embody the mighty principle of our religion, "that God has made all the families of the earth to dwell together," giving to each other, and receiving from each other; that for seventy years we practised that policy. If now we are compelled to revert to a more primitive and self-regarding one, it has only been under the pressure of a genuine fear. A nation which we had welcomed to share

with us what we had, with the same freedom as we shared it with our own children, has abused that hospitality; for one day, so to speak, as that nation sat at our board and supped with us, the mask fell and we caught the look of hatred!

But let it be known that we still believe that the ideal relationship is just that hospitality which for seventy years we practised, and that, though the fine policy has seemed to fail for a time, it will rise again and return in power.

Meanwhile, let us banish from our own speech and from our own souls every ideal or ambition which ministers exclusively to our vanity. Let us avoid the superstition of the tribal or national God. Let us be assured that only that survives which is in harmony with the true nature of things. Believing, as we do who profess allegiance to the Lord Jesus Christ, that it is one Eternal Spirit which is in all and through all and over all; let us live by words, by ideas, by ambitions of such a kind, and of such a kind only, that were God pleased to grant them to us, not we ourselves only but the whole round earth would prosper with our prosperity, and would be illumined by our light.

The prophet Isaiah, presuming to speak on behalf of God, gave a message to his own countrymen at a crisis in their fate, in words which embody an abiding principle, words, also, which state the very conditions on which God maintains any people in power. The words are: "This people have I formed for myself: they shall show forth My praise." "This people have I formed for myself,"—that is our standing, the sum and the loftiest interpretation of our history. "They shall show forth My praise,"—that is our task, that is our very business in this world.

JOHN A. HUTTON.

LITERARY ILLUSTRATIONS OF THE SONG OF SOLOMON.

v. 2. *I sleep, but my heart waketh.*

" On one of our walks in Haifa over the pleasant lowland beneath the slopes of Carmel, we came across a walled enclosure, lying back like a garden from the winding road near the sea. Its aspect was secluded and calm ; tamarisk trees abounded, and beneath them were restful and cool shadows. We opened the gate and entered the little Friedhof of the German colonists. But it was an English, not a German name, that riveted my gaze, as I glanced towards the headstone of the first grave at the end of the little avenue by which we had approached :

' ALICE, wife of LAURENCE OLIPHANT, aged 40. Died 1886. Canticles v. 2 : *En tout Nika.*'

" The lives and personalities of these gifted and noble mystics had always possessed great charm for my mind, but though the portraits of both Laurence and Alice Oliphant had been daily before our eyes on the walls of the little German hotel, I had not realised, till that moment in the quiet graveyard, that sweet, beautiful Alice Olphant had been laid to her rest in the shadow of Carmel. Than the words from the Canticles, ' I sleep but my heart waketh,' none more appropriate and touching could have been chosen for one who wrote : ' It is impossible not to yearn sometimes for the days when the partings will cease. They so lacerate and tear one's very core. Yet, except at weak moments, I realize more and more that these pains belong only to the impatience of our outer nature, not to our essential part, which remains joined to all that it has ever bound to itself with the magnet power of love.' "—A. C. INCHBOLD, *Under the Syrian Sun*, vol. ii. pp. 321–322.

Cyprian quotes this, in his treatise "on the Lord's Prayer" 31), in order to illustrate the need of watchfulness during prayer. "How careless it is to be distracted and carried away by silly and profane thoughts, when you are praying to the Lord, as if you should be thinking of anything except the fact that you are conversing with God! . . . Do you want God to be mindful of your requests when you are not mindful of yourself? That is to offend God's majesty by your carelessness in prayer, to be watchful with your eyes while your heart is asleep—whereas the Christian, even though his eyes are asleep, should be watchful with his heart, as it is written in the Song of Songs where the church says, 'I sleep, but my heart waketh.' Hence the aposfle warns us carefully and cautiously to 'continue in prayer and be watchful therein,' teaching and showing us that only those whom God sees to be watchful in prayer can obtain their requests from Him."

v. 2. *Open to me, my sister, my love, my dove, my undefiled;*
For my head is filled with dew,
And my locks with the drops of night.

"Oh, open the door, some pity to shew,
Oh, open the door to me, oh!
Tho' thou hast been false, I'll ever prove true,
Oh, open the door to me, oh!
Cauld is the blast upon my pale cheek,
But caulder thy love for me, oh!
The frost that freezes the life at my heart
Is nought to my pain for thee, oh!"

—Burns.

"She hadna been in that bigly bower,
Not a night but barely ane,
Till there was Willie, her ain true love,
Chapp'd at the door, crying 'Peace within!'

'Oh, whae is this at my bower-door,
That chaps sae late, or kens the gin?'
'Oh, it is Willie, your ain true love;
I pray you rise and let me in.'"
—Scots Ballad of 'Erlinton.'

In his history of the Arians (iv. 33), Athanasius quotes this text to prove that forcible measures taken by the civil power, such as had been adopted by the Emperor at the instigation of some Arian ecclesiastics, were incompatible with the divine spirit of persuasion. "If it was quite unbecoming for any of the bishops to alter their opinions merely from fear of the Emperor, it was far more so, and quite out of keeping with men who have confidence in their faith, to force and compel those who are unwilling. This is how the devil, with no truth on his side, attacks and beats down with axes and hammers the doors of those who admit him. But our Saviour is so gentle that He teaches: 'If any one wills to come after me,' and 'whosoever wills to be my disciple.' He comes to each, but does not force them; He knocks at the door, saying, 'Open to me, my sister, my spouse.' If they open to Him, He enters; but if they hesitate and refuse, He departs from them. For the truth is not preached with swords or with arrows, nor by means of soldiers, but by persuasion and counsel. Now, what persuasion can there be when dread of the Emperor prevails? What counsel can there be when any one who resists is given banishment and death in the long run?"

v. 9. *What is my beloved more than another beloved?*

"There is no fear in love. What is your beloved more than another man's beloved? Nothing, but it is yours."
—James Smetham's *Letters*, p. 300.

v. 10. *My beloved is white and ruddy.*

Jerome quotes this, in his famous letter to Eustochium

(31): "Fear not, Eustochium, you are endowed with a rich heritage. The Lord is your portion, and—to add to your joy—your mother has now been crowned after her long martyrdom. It is not only the shedding of blood that is counted 'confession'; the service of a devoted mind is a daily martyrdom. The one is crowned with roses and violets, the other with lilies. Hence, in the Song it is written: 'My beloved is white and ruddy,' assigning the same reward to those who overcome in peace and in warfare."

vi. 2. *My beloved is gone down into his garden.*

"The garden was fair in the morning,
And there in the road he stood,
Beyond the crimson daisies
And the bush of southern-wood.
Then side by side together
Through the grey-walled place we went;
And O the fear departed,
And the rest and sweet content!"

—William Morris.

vi. 3. *I am my beloved's, and my beloved is mine; he feedeth among the lilies.*

"I know a little garden-close,
Set thick with lily and red rose,
Where I would wander, if I might,
From dewy morn to dewy night,
And have one with me wandering."

—William Morris.

vi. 9. *My Love, my undefiled, is but one.*

"Was there no poetry in these Puritans, because they wrote no poetry? We do not mean now the unwritten tragedy of the battle-psalm and the charge; but simple

idyllic poetry and quiet home-drama, love-poetry of the heart and the hearth, and the beauties of every-day human life? Take the most commonplace of them; was Zeal-for-Truth Thoresby, of Thoresby Rise, in Deeping Fen, because his father had thought fit to give him an ugly and silly name, the less of a noble lad? . . . . Did not Zeal-for-Truth look about as wistfully for Patience as any other man would have done, longing to see her, yet not daring even to ask for her? And when she came down at last, was she the less lovely in his eyes because she came, not flounting with bare bosom, in tawdry finery and paint, but shrouded close in coif and pinner? . . . What if Zeal-for-Truth had never strung two rhymes together in his life? Did not his heart go for inspiration to a loftier Helicon, when it whispered to itself, 'My love, my dove, my undefiled, is but one!' than if he had filled pages with sonnets about Venuses and Cupids, love-sick shepherds and cruel nymphs?"—CHARLES KINGSLEY, *Plays and Puritans.*

vi. 10. *Who is she that looketh forth as the morning,*
Fair as the moon,
Clear as the sun,
Terrible as an army with banners?

"Till these last centuries the Visible Church was, at least to her children, the light of the world, as conspicuous as the sun in the heavens; and the Creed was written on her forehead, and proclaimed through her voice, by a teaching as precise as it was emphatical; in accordance with the text, 'Who is she that looketh forth as the dawn, fair as the moon, bright as the sun, terrible as an army set in array?' It was not, strictly speaking, a miracle, doubtless; but in its effect, nay, in its circumstances, it was little less."—NEWMAN, *Grammar of Assent* (ch. ix.).

"I believe, it will be found throughout the operation of

the fancy, that it has to do with the outsides of things, and is content therewith. . . . Note in *Macbeth* that brilliant instance:

> 'When the Norweyan banners flout the sky,
> And fan our people cold.'

The outward shiver and coldness of fear is seized on, and irregularly but admirably attributed by the fancy to the drift of the banners. Compare Solomon's Song, where the imagination stays not at the outside but dwells on the fearful emotion itself: 'Who is she that looketh forth on the morning; fair as the moon, clear as the sun, and terrible as an army with banners?'"—RUSKIN, *Modern Painters*, Part III., sec. ii. ch. 3.

"The poets are quite right in decking their mistresses with the spoils of the landscape, flower-gardens, gems, rainbows, flushes of morning, and stars of night, since all beauty points at identity, and whatsoever thing does not express to one the sea and the sky, day and night, is somewhat forbidden and wrong. Into every beautiful object there enters somewhat immeasurable and divine."—EMERSON, *The Conduct of Life*, ix.

vi. 11. *I went down into the garden of nuts to see the fruits of the valley, and to see whether the vine flourished and the pomegranates budded.*

"A lady, the wonder of her kind,
Whose form was upborne by a lovely mind,
Which dilating had moulded her mien and motion
Like a sea-flower unfolded beneath the ocean,

Tended the garden from morn to even. . . .

I doubt not the flowers of that garden sweet
Rejoiced in the sound of her gentle feet;

I doubt not they felt the spirit that came
From her glowing fingers thro' all their frame."

—SHELLEY, *The Sensitive Plant.*

vii. 4. *Thy nose is as the tower of Lebanon which looketh toward Damascus.*

"Inquisitive, pious Christian souls are evidently very anxious to know how I came to be converted. . . . They ask if I did not, like Saul, see a light when on the road to Damascus. No, ye credulous souls, I never journeyed to Damascus. Even the name would be unfamiliar to me, if I had not read the 'Song of Songs,' wherein King Solomon compares the nose of his beloved to a tower looking towards Damascus."—HEINE, *Religion and Philosophy in Germany.*

vii. 12. *Let us get up early to the vineyards . . . there will I give thee all my loves.*

"Where, over fig-tree and orange in tier upon tier still repeated,
Garden on garden upraised, balconies step to the sky,—
Ah, that I were far away from the crowd and the streets of the city,
Under the vine-trellis laid, O my beloved, with thee."

—CLOUGH.

viii. 5. *Who is this that cometh up from the wilderness leaning upon her beloved?*

Augustine, in his treatise on Grace and Freewill (xiii.), quotes this to prove that grace is needed for the Christian life. "This is why it is written of the Church herself in Canticles: 'Who is this that cometh up in white raiment, leaning on the arm of her beloved?' She who could never become so pure in raiment by herself, has been clad in white . . . and now that she is white, she walks aright—yet, only by continuing to lean constantly on Him by whom

she has been made white. Wherefore Jesus Himself, on whom the Church leans in her white robes, said to His disciples : 'Without me ye can do nothing.'"

viii 6. *Set me as a seal upon thine heart,*
As a seal upon thine arm.

"Seals anciently had engraven upon them two things—the image and the name of the person whose seal it was Therefore when Christ says to His spouse, Set me as a seal upon thine heart, as a seal upon thine arm ! it is as much as to say, Let My name and image remain impressed there."—JONATHAN EDWARDS, *The Religious Affections*, part iii., *section* 1.

viii. 6. *For love is strong as death.*

Burns wrote to his friend, William Nicol, on June 18, 1787 : "I will close my letter with this tribute my heart bids me pay you—the many ties of acquaintance and friendship which I have, or think I have, in life, I have felt along the lines, and they are almost all of them of such frail contexture that I am sure they would not stand the breath of the least adverse breeze of fortune ; but, from you, my ever dear sir, I look with confidence for the apostolic love that shall wait on me 'through good report and bad report' —the love which Solomon emphatically says 'is strong as death.'"

"Revenge triumphs over Death ; Love slights it."
—BACON.

"Love is rightly said to be 'strong as death,' either because, like death, it is unconquerable, or because love's measure in this life is unto death—as the Lord says, 'Greater love hath no one than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends'—or rather because as death tears the soul from the bodily senses, so love tears it from fleshly lusts."—AUGUSTINE (to Jerome, *epist.* clxvii. 11).

"Each must sometimes fall back upon the soul; he must challenge this apparition with the thought of death; he must ask himself for the mainspring and value of his life. He will then remember his stifled loves; he will feel that only his illusions have ever given him a sense of reality, only his passions the hope and the vision of peace."—SANTAYANA, *Poetry and Religion*, p. 268.

Jealousy is cruel as the grave.

"Jealousy is said to be the offspring of love. Yet, unless the parent makes haste to strangle the child, the child will not rest till it has poisoned the parent."—AUGUSTUS HARE, in *Guesses at Truth*, p. 118.

"There is a complaint which neither poppy, nor mandragora, nor all the drowsy syrups of the East could allay, in the men in his time, as we are informed by a popular poet of the days of Elizabeth; and which, when exhibited in women, no medical discoveries or practice subsequent—neither homœopathy nor hydropathy nor mesmerism nor Dr. Simpson, nor Dr. Locock can cure, and that is—we won't call it jealousy, but rather denominate it rivalry and emulation in ladies."—THACKERAY, *Pendennis* (ch. lii.).

"His resignation was not spared the torments of jealousy: the cruel, insensate, poignant, and imbecile jealousy, when it seems that a woman betrays us simply by this that she exists, that she breathes—and when the deep movements of her nerves or her soul become a matter of distracting suspicion, of killing doubt, of mortal anxiety."—JOSEPH CONRAD, *Within the Tides*, p. 45.

viii. 7. *Many waters cannot quench love,*
neither can the floods drown it.

"They spoke very little of their mutual feelings; pretty phrases and warm expressions being probably unnecessary between such tried friends. Theirs was that substantial

affection which arises (if any arises at all) when the two who are thrown together begin first by knowing the rougher sides of each other's character, and not the best till further on, the romance growing up in the interstices of a mass of hard prosaic reality. This good-fellowship—*Camaraderie*—usually occurring through similarity of pursuits, is unfortunately seldom superadded to love between the sexes, because men and women associate, not in their labours, but in their pleasures merely. Where, however, happy circumstance permits its development, the compounded feeling proves itself to be the only love which is strong as death—that love which many waters cannot quench, nor the floods drown, beside which the passion usually called by the name is evanescent as steam."—Thomas Hardy, *Far from the Madding Crowd*, ch. 56.

"Give me the flame no dampness dulls
The passion of the instinctive pulse,
Love steadfast as a fixed star,
Tender as doves with nestlings are,
More large than time, more strong than death;
This all creation travails of—
She groans not for a passing breath—
This is Forget-me-Not and Love."

—C. G. Rossetti.

"It is not *quenched by many waters.* Many imperfections and infirmities, differences in opinion, wrongs received, will not altogether quench love."—Guthrie of Fenwick, *The Christian's Great Interest*, ch. iv.

If a man would give all the substance of his house for love,
It would utterly be contemned.

"No man may mount upon a golden stair,
Guido my master, to Love's palace-sill:

No key of gold will fit the lock that's there,
Nor heart there enter without pure goodwill."
—D. G. Rossetti, *Dante and his Circle*, p. 141.

"Gold and iron are good,
To buy iron and gold:
All earth's fleece and food
For their like are sold.
Hinted Merlin wise,
Proved Napoleon great—
Nor kind nor coinage buys
Aught above its rate."

—Emerson.

viii. 8. *We have a little sister, and she hath no breasts.*

"Many estimable persons . . . feel that to *plan* a sin is itself a sin; but God is with them an Avenger, not a spiritual Rewarder: they reverence Him indeed, but do not at all aspire to love Him. . . . Religion is to them, according to its received etymology, a bond or band; recognised indeed by their conscience, and in so far internal; yet, not an inward living force. It rather restrains them externally, than animates them; still, when we see what human nature is and has been, we must count this a great step forward. Of this respectable and worthy class, we may say: 'We have a little sister, and she has no breasts.' To drive away from our sympathies, by haughty airs of superiority, those who are only in an earlier stage of advancement than ourselves, is so harsh and so unwise, as to be a spot of Pharisaism upon us. . . .

To those who were religious but not spiritual, we above applied the words: 'We have a little sister, and she has no breasts': but behold, the little sister is grown up, and she still has no breasts, for she is a Man! And this opens to us the relation of the two classes, in their present develop-

ment. We see in them the Man-soul and the Woman-soul, that which thinks and that which feels, the negative and the positive, the formal and the instinctive, the principle of conservatism and the principle of progress: in the one the conscience, in the other the affection, takes the lead; yet one without the other could never be made perfect."—F. W. Newman, *The Soul*, pp. 52, 112.

viii. 12. *My vineyard which is mine is before me.*

"O weel befa' the guileless heart
In cottage, bught, or pen!
And weel befa' the bonny May
That wons in yonder glen;
Wha lo'es the good and true sae weel—
Wha's aye sae kind and aye sae leal,
And pure as blooming asphodel
Amang sae mony men."

—James Hogg.

James Moffatt.

INDEX.

PAGE

Rev. Edwin A. Abbott, D.D.
The Star in the East, II. 23

Rev. Professor B. W. Bacon, D.D.
The Petrine Supplements of Matthew 1

Rev. Professor Vernon Bartlet, D.D.
Titus the Friend of Luke, and other Related Questions . 367

Rev. Principal W. H. Bennett, Litt.D.
The Spiritual Aspect of War 286

Rev. W. S. Bishop, D.D.
The Theology of the Holy Spirit 264

Rev. E. F. Brown, M.A.
Some Considerations on the Pastoral Epistles . . 212

Rev. Professor C. J. Cadoux, M.A., B.D.
The Attitude of Jesus to the Jewish Administration of Justice 309

Rev. J. Robertson Cameron, M.A.
The Mystery of Christ 241

Rev. Professor G. A. Cooke, D.D.
The Land of Promise 204

Rev. Canon Anthony C. Deane, M.A.
The Ministry of John the Baptist 420

Rev. W. D. Gardiner, M.A., B.D.
The Italian Origin of the Epistle to the Hebrews . . 60

Professor Frank Granger, Litt.D.
The Communist Significance of the Logia . . . 401

Rev. Professor H. M. Haydn, M.A., B.D.
"Out of the Mouth of Babes and Sucklings": A Suggestion for Psalm viii. 2, 3 232

Rev. Professor A. G. Hogg, M.A.
Meekness and Public Spirit 321

Rev. John A. Hutton, D.D.
The New "Constraint of Christ" 43
"From Jahveh to Elohim: From the Particular to the Universal" 454

PAGE

Rev. Maurice Jones, D.D.
The Significance of St. Stephen in the History of the Primitive Church 161

Rev. Professor H. A. A. Kennedy, D.D.
St. Paul and the Law 338

Rev. John Macaskill, M.A.
A Transformation in Socratic Criticism—The Analogy Applied 222

Lieut.-Col. G. Mackinlay, Late R.A.
Lucan Triplications 145

Rev. Professor H. R. Mackintosh, D.D.
Thoughts on Infant Baptism 193

Rev. R. A. C. Macmillan, M.A., D.Phil.
The Work that Christ has Done 124

Rev. Professor D. S. Margoliouth, Litt.D., F.B.A.
Baptizing with Fire 446

Enrico Masini, LL.D.
When was Jesus Christ Born? 178

Rev. Professor James Moffatt, D.D., Litt.D.
Literary Illustrations of the Song of Solomon. . 391, 461

Rev. Professor D. Plooij, D.D.
Again the Work of St. Luke 108

Rev. M. A. Power, S.J.
The Talmud and the Date of the Crucifixion . . . 147

Rev. J. G. Radford, B.D.
The Moral Value of Parabolic Teaching 151

Rev. J. E. Roberts, M.A., B.D.
Thoughts on Infant Baptism 432

Rev. Professor A. T. Robertson, D.D.
Paul not a Sacramentarian 143
The Primacy of Judas Iscariot 278

Rev. Edgar Rogers, M.A.
Jewish Coins and Messianic Traditions: A Reply to Dr. Caster 29

Rev. C. F. Russell, M.A.
The Influence of the Baptist on the Mind of Jesus . 53

Rev. M. H. Segal, M.A.
Pharisees and Sadducees 81

Rev. Canon A. Sloman, M.A.
The Parable of the Unjust Steward 57

Rev. Professor W. H. Griffith Thomas, D.D. PAGE
The Place of the Sacraments in the Teaching of St. Paul . 375

Rev. William Watson, B.D.
The Human and the Superhuman Messiahs . . . 63

Rev. Walter R. Whately, M.A.
The Woman with a Spirit of Infirmity 385

Rev. Robert Wood, M.A. [Wellington, N.Z.].
Shall We Commemorate our Dead by Visible Monuments ? 134

The Author of "The Sacrament."
Prayer 302

INDEX TO SUBJECTS.

PAGE
Again the Work of St. Luke . . 108
Attitude of Jesus to the Jewish Administration of Justice, The 309
Baptizing with Fire 446
Baptism, Thoughts on Infant 193, 432
Communist Significance of the Logia, The 401
"Constraint of Christ," The New 43
Crucifixion, The Talmud and the Date of the 147
Epistle to the Hebrews, The Italian Origin of the. . . . 60
From Jahveh to Elohim: From the Particular to the Universal 454
Holy Spirit, The Theology of the 264
Human and the Superhuman Messiahs, The 63
Influence of the Baptist on the Mind of Jesus, The 53
Italian Origin of the Epistle to the Hebrews, The 60
Jewish Administration of Justice, The Attitude of Jesus to the . 309
Jewish Coins and Messianic Traditions: A Reply to Dr. Gaster 29
John the Baptist, The Ministry of 420
Judas Iscariot, The Primacy of . 278
Land of Promise, The 204
Literary Illustrations of the Song of Solomon 391, 461
Logia, The Communist Significance of the 401
Lucan Triplications 145
Luke, Again the Work of St.. . 108
Luke, Titus the Friend of . . . 367
Matthew, The Petrine Supplements of 1
Meekness and Public Spirit . . 321
Messianic Traditions, Jewish Coins and 29
Ministry of John the Baptist, The 420
Moral Value of Parabolic Teaching, The 151
Mystery of Christ, The . . . 241
New "Constraint of Christ," The 43
PAGE
"Out of the Mouth of Babes and Sucklings" 232
Parable of the Unjust Steward, The 57
Parabolic Teaching, The Moral Value of 151
Pastoral Epistles, Some Considerations on the 212
Paul not a Sacramentarian . . 143
Petrine Supplements of Matthew, The 1
Pharisees and Sadducees . . . 81
Place of the Sacraments in the Teaching of St. Paul, The . . 375
Prayer 302
Primacy of Judas Iscariot, The . 278
Psalm viii. 2, 3 232
Public Spirit, Meekness and . . 321
St. Paul and the Law 338
Shall we commemorate our Dead by Visible Monuments ? . . 134
Significance of St. Stephen in the History of the Primitive Christian Church 161
Socratic Criticism, A Transformation in 222
Some Considerations on the Pastoral Epistles 212
Song of Solomon, Literary Illustrations of the 391, 461
Spiritual Aspect of War, The . 286
Star in the East, The, II . . . 23
Talmud and the Date of the Crucifixion, The 147
Theology of the Holy Spirit, The 264
Thoughts on Infant Baptism 193, 432
Titus the Friend of Luke, and other related Questions . . . 367
Transformation in Socratic Criticism, A: The Analogy Applied 222
Unjust Steward, The Parable of the 57
War, The Spiritual Aspect of. . 286
When was Jesus Christ Born ? . 178
Woman with a Spirit of Infirmity, The 385
Work of St. Luke, Again the . 108
Work that Christ has Done, The. 124

INDEX TO TEXTS.

	PAGE
Gen. i. 1–3	231
Exod. xxi. 23–25	315
xxxiv. 7	209
Lev. xvi. 2	95
Num. xi. 29	210
xii. 8	207
xxi. 20	207
xxviii. 2, 3, 4.	95
Deut. i. 37	204
xix. 16–21	95
xxiv. 1–4	204
xxv. 4	343
xxviii. 1, 2, 15	340
xxx. 19.	340
Josh. xiii. 1	211
Ezra ix. 32, 33, 36	341
Job xxxiii. 7	26
Ps. viii. 2, 3	232
xxxv. 21	238
lxxii. 8	210
lxxiii. 8, 9	238
cxliii. 2	349
Prov. xxii. 3	236
Song of Solomon i. 1	391
i. 4, 5, 6	393
i. 15	394
ii. 2	394
ii. 8, 9	395
ii. 10–12	395
ii. 17	397
iii. 1, 2	398
iii. 7, 8	399
iv. 7	399
iv. 12	399–400
iv. 16	400
v. 2	461, 462
v. 9, 10	463
vi. 2, 3, 9	464
vi. 10	464
vi. 11	466
vii. 4, 12	467
viii. 5	467
viii. 6	468
viii. 7	469
viii. 8	471
viii. 12	472
Isa. xi. 1	64
xxvii. 13	75
Dan. vii. 13	73
Hosea xii. 13	206
Micah v. 2	65
Zech. ix. 10	210
Matt. ii. 6	26
iii. 11	425, 446
v. 38–42	316
v. 40	314
vi. 6	415
vii. 1–5	315
vii. 6	1
vii. 13–23	2
x. 6, 23	1
xi. 25–27	228
xiii. 13	151
xiii. 24, 30, 36–43	2
xiv. 28–31	8
xvi. 6–12	227
xviii. 1	282
xviii. 4	283
xx. 7	3
xx. 21	284
xxi. 15, 16	238
xxii. 11–14.	2
xxiii. 2, 3	86
xxiii. 34, 39	3
xxiv. 11 f.	2
xxiv. 30	73
xxiv. 31	75
xxv. 31.	74
xxvi. 29	228
Mark i. 4	425
i. 7	446
iv. 11	255
iv. 11, 12	151
iv. 26–29	2
viii. 33	281
viii. 38	74
ix. 34, 35	283
ix. 38–40	2
x. 37, 41	284
xii. 35–37	65
xii. 26	73
xiv. 62	72
Luke ii. 4, 8	26
ii. 10	113
iii. 16	446
iv. 18	315
vi. 40	318
vi. 37–42	315
vi. 43–46	2
viii. 10	151
ix. 44, 45	257
xvi. 1–14	57
xviii. 25	58
xxii. 14	284
John i. 1–5	231
i. 26	447
i. 52	272
ii. 20	185
iii. 13	229
iii. 34	415
iv. 2.	268
v. 52	382
vi. 61–63	269
vii. 39	267
xii. 23 f.	270
xiv. 12	318
xiv. 18, 19	266
xv. 3	378
xvii. 16	378
xx. 22	268
Acts i, 11	146
ii. 32, 36	146
iii. 14	173
vi. 6	175
viii. 1	174
ix. 4	370
xiii. 25	447
xv. 2.	215
xix. 1–7	275
xx. 4.	370
xx. 25	368
xxiii. 7, 10	215
xxv. 25	215
xxvi. 14	351
xxvi. 31, 32.	215
Rom. i. 3, 4	272
ii. 13, 17	342
iii. 19	348
iii. 20	349
iv. 14	352
v. 20	348
vi. 7	355
vii. 1	355
vii. 4	355
vii. 7–11	346
vii. 12, 14, 22, 25	344
vii. 13	348
viii. 2	270
viii. 16	274
viii. 26, 27	274
x. 4	353
x. 5	362
xiii. 8–10	359
1 Cor. iv. 17	372
x. 16–21	380
xi. 29	380
2 Cor. v. 14	355
v. 16	273
viii. 18.	368
Gal. ii. 19	351
ii. 20	146
ii. 21	250, 353
iii. 10	341
iii. 12	352
iii. 19.	348
iii. 21.	351
iii. 23–26.	360
iv. 8–13	363
v. 3	341
vi. 2	359
Eph. ii. 14–16	366
iv. 8, 9, 10	270, 271
Phil. i. 25	216
Col. ii. 3	76
ii. 14	365
1 Thess. iv. 16	74
1 Tim. vi. 10	57
2 Tim. ii. 15	216
Heb. ii. 9	271
ii. 16, 17	262
1 Pet. iii. 21	381
v. 12	251
Rev. i. 7.	72

Printed in Great Britain by Butler & Tanner, Frome and London

GTU Library
3 2400 00276 5844

Expositor
v.13
1917:1
OCT 6 1920
Ser-8
v. 13
1917:1
Expositor